DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 655	95	TM 004 925

TITLE	Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the U.S. Office of Education: FY 1974.
INSTITUTION	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	390p.; For related documents, see ED 065 738 and ED 082 300
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$19.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education Programs; American Indians; *Annual Reports; Compensatory Education Programs; Developmental Programs; Educational Legislation; *Educational Programs; Educational Technology; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; Handicapped; Higher Education; Library Programs; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Office of Education

ABSTRACT

A comprehensive report on Office of Education programs is provided in this evaluation of the programs for the 1974 fiscal year (FY). This report also updates and extends the FY 1973 report and provides additional information from 1974 program operations and monitoring activities. The status of the evaluation function itself is breifly discussed; a general overview is made of the effectiveness of the Office of Education programs, and short evaluation reports are provided for each of the educational programs and legislative titles. These reports appear under the following categories of programs: Elementary and Secondary Education Programs, Education for the Handicapped Programs, Vocational and Adult Education Programs, Higher Education Programs, Education Professions Development Programs, Library Programs, Educational Technology Programs, Special Demonstration Programs, and Indian Education Programs. The three principal thrusts of the Office of Education programs are seen as being: (1) equalizing educational opportunities; (2) improving the quality and relevance of American education; and (3) providing limited general support to selected educational functions and activities. (BJG)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED115655

TM

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON PROGRAMS
ADMINISTERED BY THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

FY 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Office of Education
Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation

TM004 925

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS: FY 1974

Table of Contents

Introduction   Page

A. Background 1
B. History of Evaluation in the Office of Education 2
C. Report Content 4
D. Overview of the Effectiveness of OE Programs 5
E. Highlights of Completed Studies 28
F. Studies in Process 42
G. Uses of Evaluation Studies 57

A. Elementary and Secondary Education Programs 66

  1. Education of Disadvantaged Children 67
  2. Supplementary Educational Centers and Services: Guidance, Counseling, and Testing 83
  3. Strengthening State and Local Education Agencies 89
  4. Bilingual Education 93
  5. Follow Through 104
  6. School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Maintenance and Operation 107
  7. School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: Construction 111
  8. Emergency School Assistance (Desegregation Assistance) 115
  9. Training and Advisory Services, Title IV, Civil Rights Act 123

B. Education for the Handicapped Programs 128

  1. State Grant Program 129
  2. Aid to States for Education of Handicapped: Children in State Operated Schools 132
  3. Regional Resource Centers 135
  4. Deaf/Blind Centers 137
  5. Early Childhood Education 139
  6. Special Education Manpower Development 141
  7. Recruitment and Information 144
  8. Innovation and Development 146
  9. Media Services and Captioned Films 148
  10. Specific Learning Disabilities 150

C. Vocational and Adult Education Programs 152

  1. Vocational Education: Basic Grants to States 153

Page

C. Vocational and Adult Education Programs Cont'd.

2. Vocational Education: Programs for Students with: Special Needs 163
3. Vocational Education: Research and Training 165
4. Vocational Education: Exemplary Programs 167
5. Vocational Education: Consumer and Homemaking: Education 170
6. Vocational Education: Cooperative Education Programs . . 173
7. Vocational Education: Work Study Programs 178
8. Vocational Education: Curriculum Development 181
9. Adult Education: Basic Grants to States 183
10. Adult Education: Special Projects 187
11. Adult Education: Teacher Training 190
12. Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) 192

D. Higher Education Programs 197

1. Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program 198
2. Supplementary Educational Opportunity Grants Program . . 201
3. State Student Incentive Grant Program 203
4. College Work-Study Program 205
5. Cooperative Education Program 209
6. Guranteed Student Loan Program 213
7. National Direct Student Loan Program 217
8. Upward Bound Program 221
9. Educational Talent Search Program 227
10. Educational Opportunity Centers 230
11. Special Services for Disadvantaged Students 232
12. Strengthening Developing Institutions 237
13. Annual Interest Grants 240
14. Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Academic: Facilities 243
15. State Postsecondary Education Commissions 246
16. Language Training and Area Studies 248
17. Fulbright-Hays Act 251
18. Community Service and Continuing Education Program 253
19. Land Grant Colleges and Universities Program 255
20. College Teacher Fellowships 257
21. Higher Education Personnel Fellowships 259
22. EPDA, Part E Institutes 262
23. College Personnel Development, Fellowships for the: Disadvantaged 264
24. College Personnel Development, Allen J. Ellender: Fellowships 266

D. Higher Education Programs Cont'd — Page

25. Veterans Cost of Instruction Program 268
26. Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities 270
27. Ethnic Heritage Studies Program 271-A

E. Education Professions Development Programs 272

1. Teacher Corps Program 273
2. Career Opportunities Program 280
3. Exceptional Children Program 284
4. Urban/Rural School Development Program 287
5. Vocational Education Personnel Program 290

F. Library Programs 294

1. Library Services 295
2. Public Library Construction 301
3. Interlibrary Cooperative Services 303
4. College Library Resources 305
5. Training in Librarianship 307
6. Library Demonstrations 310
7. School Library Resources 313
8. Undergraduate Instructional Equipment 318
9. Elementary and Secondary Equipment and Minor Remodeling .. 320

G. Educational Technology Programs 323

1. Educational Broadcasting Facilities 324
2. Educational Television Programming Support: Sesame Street and Electric Company 327

H. Special Demonstration Programs 331

1. Right-to-Read 332
2. Drug Abuse Education 335
3. Environmental Education 338
4. Health and Nutrition 341
5. Dropout Prevention 342
6. General Program Dissemination, Office of Public Affairs .. 345

I. Indian Education Programs 347

1. Revision of Impacted Areas as It Relates to Indian Children 348
2. Special Programs and Projects to Improve Educational Opportunities for Indian Children 351
3. Special Programs Relating to Adult Education for Indians. 353

J. Program Evaluations Completed and In Process 355

Annual Evaluation Report on Programs
Administered by the U.S. Office of Education

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Section 417 of the General Education Provision Act as amended by Public Law 93-380 dated August 21, 1974 requires that, "not later than November 1 of each year, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate, an annual evaluation report which evaluates the effectiveness of applicable programs in achieving their legislated purposes..." The legislation goes on to specify in detail what the report shall contain.

This legislation is not a new mandate but rather a revision and expansion of previous Section 413 of the General Education Provisions Act which required "a report evaluating the results and effectiveness of programs and projects assisted thereunder during the preceding fiscal year..." Since there was not sufficient lead time between the enactment of the new legislation and the new November 1st due date" to prepare the FY 74 report in a format to meet the revised requirements, Congressional Staff recommended that for FY 74 the old format and reporting date be continued.

This is the fourth consecutive year that a comprehensive report on all Office of Education programs is being submitted. It updates and extends the FY 73 report and incorporates the results of the evaluation studies completed during FY 74 (20 studies) as well as additional information obtained from program operations and monitoring activities. The report covers Office of Education programs as of June 30, 1974. Any program decisions, budget or legislative activities subsequent to that date are not reflected in this report.

B. History of Evaluation in the Office of Education

Systematic, comprehensive evaluation of Federal education programs dates back only to FY 1971. This was due to lack of appropriated funds for evaluation and technically qualifed evaluation staff prior to FY 1970. The FY 1970 appropriation of $9.5 million was the first important amount made available specifically for planning and evaluating OE programs, and a considerable tooling up effort was necessary to launch the first series of major evaluation projects. However, it was not until FY 1971 that steps leading to the present organization and process were initiated. The evaluation function was centralized in a staff office reporting to the Commissioner (the Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation). The recruitment and training of a technically trained staff of evaluators was undertaken, and an evaluation planning process was started. In the four years that have elapsed since then more than one hundred studies have been designed and initiated (approximately 50 have been completed), a dissemination process for distributing the results of evaluation studies to the Congress, OMB, GAO, and the education community has been implemented, and a procedure to enable evaluation findings to influence the policy and management decision process (the Policy Implications Memorandum) has been developed.

The following table shows the funds available under the P&E line item for education, planning and evaluation for the period FY 1968 - 1975:

TABLE I 1/

FY 1968	$ 1,250,000	
FY 1969	1,250,000	
FY 1970	9,512,000	2/
FY 1971	12,475,000	2/ 3/
FY 1972	11,225,000	3/ 4/
FY 1973	10,205,000	3/
FY 1974	5,200,000	3/
FY 1975	6,858,000	3/

1/ Does not include program funds authorized for evaluation of Follow Through, the Emergency School Assistance Act, nor program funds used by State and local education agencies for evaluations of ESEA Titles I, III, VII and VIII. In FY 75 an additional $3 million was made available from various program set-asides to cover OE studies mandated by P.L. 93-380.

2/ Does not include $5 million appropriated for grants to States for planning and evaluation under ESEA, Title V C.

3/ Includes support for the Educational Policy Research Centers at Syracuse and SRI which was transferred to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education in FY 74.

4/ Excludes $1 million earmarked for NIE Planning.

C. Report Content

The report contains descriptions of each of the programs administered by the Office of Education as of June 30, 1974. Included in the description of each program is its legislative authorization, its funding history, its purpose and operational approach, its scope, information about its effectiveness, current or planned evaluation studies and sources of evaluation data.

Since not all programs have yet been the subject of formal evaluations, effectiveness information has varying degrees of "hardness" and objectivity. The best and most objective effectiveness data results from completed formal evaluation studies. Where these are not available, program operating data, audit reports project director evaluations and reports and similar data are presented. The sources of these data are varied and represent the efforts of many units within the Office of Education as well as some organizations outside of OE. These include evaluation studies by OPBE and various contractors, data compiled by NCES, data from program managers, data from HEW Audit Agency, GAO reports, data from State and local agencies, etc. The data sources are identified. In some cases, however such as a financial support-type program or a newly funded program little can be said about effectiveness. Where applicable, this is indicated. In all cases every effort has been made to be factual, objective and candid.

D. Overview of the Effectiveness of OE Programs

Over the years educational legislation has been enacted and programs created in response to a variety of interests and needs as perceived by the Congress and various administrations. Although the approach has been piecemeal and directions have changed, the approximately 100 education programs or legislative titles can be grouped into three general categories:

. Programs equalize educational opportunity for groups and individuals who are at a disadvantaged educationally by reason of socio-economic, racial, geographic, or physical and mental handicapping conditions.

. Programs to improve the quality and relevance of American Education primarily through research, development, experimentation, demonstration, dissemination, evaluation, and training activities.

. Programs to provide limited general support to selected education functions and activities such as libraries, State education agencies, construction, developing institutions, vocational education, impact aid, etc.

1. General Conclusions

The previous reports included a broad assessment of how well the objectives in these three categories were being achieved through the variety of programs devoted to them. Changes in the last few years have not been so large as to modify the overall picture, and in general, it was concluded that:

. Although the largest Federal thrust has been the attempt to redress various inequalities in educational opportunity, none of the programs individually or all the programs collectively, have yet succeeded in achieving all of their objectives. Nevertheless, the programs in the aggregate seem to be making slow but substantial progress towards the goal of equalizing educational opportunity for all American citizens.

. The research, experimentation, demonstration, dissemination. and training activities have not been regarded generally as highly successful despite the fact that a number of successes have been achieved with individual pr [illegible] ongressional recognition of the shortcomings in the Federal ed [illegible] R&D effort over the years led to the establishment of the National Institute of Education (NIE) and the transfer of most OE responsibility in this area to the NIE (Public Law 92-318, 92nd Congress - Education Amendments of 1972). Only a few specialized R&D efforts in the handicapped and vocational education areas remain with OE.

. The provision of selected general support has helped schools and colleges in such areas as impact aid, construction and equipment programs, basic grants to States for vocational and adult education, aid to land grant colleges, public library programs and the purchase of school and college library materials.

2. Elementary and Secondary Education Programs

Evaluations for most of the Federally supported Elementary and Secondary Education programs are underway and the results are now starting to become available. Most of the evaluation activities can be placed in one of five categories:

(1) Studies which assess the impact of special programs for education of disadvantaged children;

(2) Studies which assess the impact of school desegregation;

(3) Studies which assess the effects of efforts to bring about change in elementary and secondary education;

(4) Planning studies to bring about change in education of disadvantaged children; and

(5) Efforts to provide technical assistance to SEAs on evaluation matters.

(1) Assessing the impact of special programs for education of disadvantaged children. Since the Federal government began in the 1960's to recognize the plight of disadvantaged children, many education programs have been initiated at the Federal, State and local level. Most began without benefit of guidance from research on effective learning methods and have proceeded for some years without clear evidence as to their impact on children. Thus, one of the main purposes of evaluation in the area of elementary and secondary education is to provide such evidence both with respect to programs as a whole and with respect to individual State, school district, school or classroom approaches to education for disadvantaged children. Such information which is not yet generally available, is needed if there are to be significant improvements in either Federal or State and local programs.

The major on-going or recently completed evaluations in this category are the Compensatory Reading Study (focusing on ESEA Title I), An Impact Evaluation of the Bilingual Program, the Follow Through evaluation, the evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program, and the evaluations of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic and Pilot Programs. Each of these projects is aimed at determining the effect of program activities on cognitive and affective changes in students. In the Compensatory Reading Study, for example, compensatory reading programs which are offered to disadvantaged children are described and their effects on reading skill attainment determined through the use of pre-post measures on a national sample of children. Preliminary results indicate a growth trend in reading skills up to 1965 and a slight decline since. The study has also indentified a a variety of compensatory reading approaches and a number of unusually effective programs. Their effectiveness, however, does not seem to be consistent at all grade levels, but tends to be more pronounced at either the lower or higher levels.

The Follow Through program provides a rough approximation to a large-scale experiment in education. Despite many problems, the program has fostered development of twenty-two compensatory education models and the preliminary results from a national evaluation of ten of these models suggests that some of the models may provide unusually effective means for remediating the educational deficits of disadvantaged children while other models turn out to be disappointingly ineffective. However, the main purpose of the program--to develop and evaluate alternative approaches to education of disadvantaged children--is being achieved and future results will amplify on the preliminary findings now available.

(2) Assessing the impact of school desegregation programs. A second major Federal concern in elementary and secondary education has been to further equal educational opportunity through programs designed to help achieve successful school desegregation. Beginning with the first Emergency School Aid Program (ESAP-I), evaluations of the major program components have been undertaken each year. A recently completed ESAP-II evaluation and the on-going ESAA evaluations

measure the impact of the Federal programs on racial climate in the schools and the acquisition of basic skills by students. The amount of desegregation taking place is not an issue since that is a precondition to the grant. However, the ESAA Basic and Pilot program evaluations provide an opportunity to determine the relative effectiveness of three types of educational intervention--desegregation, desegregation in combination with compensatory education, and compensatory education without desegregation--in comparison to no special intervention in minority isolated schools.

Findings so far indicate significant achievement gains by black male high school students, the very subgroup of students most in need of improvement. The gains seem to be associated with improved race relations in ESAP schools. Further findings show that human relations programs were effective in improving the attitudes of white urban students toward integration and that race relations within a school have more of an effect on student achievement than the racial mix.

(3) Assessing the effects of efforts to bring about change in elementary and secondary education. Several Federal programs are aimed at changing the traditional ways in which schools operate, i.e., what goes on in the classroom, how the schools serve special target groups (e.g., the handicapped, non-English speaking, potential dropouts), etc. In some ways, nearly all evaluation projects in the elementary and secondary area touch upon the issue of change but several are directly focused on the matter.

Several years ago, when concern about the apparent ineffectiveness of education for the disadvantaged was mounting, the lack of information about the effects of large-scale, intensive programs was noted. To fill this gap, a study was initiated to review such programs as ESEA Title III and Title VIII the Dropout Prevention Program. This evaluation, the Longitudinal Study of Demonstration Education Programs, is yielding information about the impact on student outcomes of programs involving (1) a high proportion of students in the school, (2) a significant commitment of resources and (3) a departure from traditional classroom practices. It is thus a study of situations where LEAs have made relatively large-scale, long-term commitments to changing what happens in the classroom. Preliminary findings seem to indicate that innovative programs tend to regress over time to more traditional approaches. With regard to student outcomes early findings indicate different patterns of effectiveness for different SES's (socio-economic status), although it is too soon to generalize.

Another study focusing on four Federal change agent programs (ESEA Title III, ESEA Title VII, Vocational Education Act Part D, and Right-to-Read) is looking not at effects on students but on the factors which promote or inhibit educational change. In addition, this study will make a more intensive examination of Title III and its basic strategy and will try to determine the degree to which projects are truly innovative, the proportions of projects which continue after the Federal money phases out, and the extent to which projects spawn replications. The study is still ongoing, but early findings indicate that Federal programs and funds seem to have increased the rate of adoption of new projects, but seem to have little measureable effect on student achievement. Study findings also seem to indicate that the interaction of the project with its institutional setting and implementation problems dominate the outcome of change processes in the educational system. Thus, these need as much attention as the project itself.

(4) Planning for Change in Education. Despite progress, American school systems as a whole are still not accomplishing the goal of equal educational opportunity. Achievement levels for disadvantaged children, on the average, are still lower than for the rest of the school population; dropout rates are higher; college entrance rates are lower, and so on. Nevertheless, there do seem to be some successful projects operating in some schools. Given the very large and decentralized nature of the school system, however, a major problem is how to foster the spread of successful programs and how to weed out unsuccessful ones.

A major effort in this direction is the development of the Project Information Packages, detailed how-to-do-it descriptions for proven approaches to compensatory reading and mathematics. Development of six packages was completed in the spring of 1974 and a field test of the packaging concept was recently begun. The long range plans are to continue development and implementation of pacakges in 1975 and beyond through a new OE program established in FY 75.

Another activity which grew out of an earlier evaluation of the Federal program to support desegregating schools (ESAP-II) is aimed at identifying school programs, policies, and practices that contribute most to achieving and maintaining exemplary desegregated schools. Here again the goal is to provide information for use by principals, superintendents, and other educational policy makers who wish to advance the prospects for equal educational opportunity. Although an earlier feasibility report was discouraging, a later analysis of data collected in FY 1974 suggested that there were schools exemplary in race relations at both the elementary and secondary level which may be able to serve as models. This is now being pursued.

(5) Provision of technical assistance on evaluation matters Section 151 of Public Law 93-380 requires the Commissioner of Education to become more active in providing guidance to States with respect to the evaluation of Title I.

One project which began in FY 74 and will continue in FY 75 will result in models for State Title I evaluation reports. An FY 73 project is yielding, among other things, two documents dealing with evaluation of compensatory education. One is addressed to local education agencies and provides technical guidance (including particular evaluation models) for program evaluation; the second is aimed at State agency personnel and provides them with a guidebook for analyzing and making judgments about the effects of compensatory education programs based upon local evaluation reports. These on-going activities will contribute substantially towards the goal of providing States with technical assistance on the evaluation of Title I.

3. Evaluations of Education Programs for the Handicapped

The programs authorized under the Education for the Handicapped Act may be loosely grouped into three categories, indicating variations in strategies of support:

- Programs providing direct service. This includes the State Grant program, the Deaf-Blind Centers, the Regional Resource Centers, and the service functions performed by the Media Services and Captioned Films program (including the Information part of the Recruitment and Information activities).
- Programs which develop and demonstrate new technologies, materials, or models for serving the handicapped. This includes the Early Childhood program, the Specific Learning Disabilities program, the Innovation and Development program, and the development of new media and materials under the Media Services program.
- Special Education Manpower Development provides the support function of training teachers and other educational personnel to work with the handicapped student.

Across all categories, the general role of the Federal government is a catalytic one, whereby "seed" money is provided to States and other grantees, in order to stimulate increases in both the quantity and quality of services provided by States.

The evaluation strategy with regard to programs for the handicapped has been to accomplish two objectives:

1) to obtain objective data on the effectiveness of specific programs, particularly those which represent a major Federal investment of funds;

2) to provide information of a broader, policy-relevant nature, which enables the Federal government to better plan for current and proposed programs for the handicapped.

Efforts toward the first objective are reflected by evaluation of: the Aid-to-States program (EHA, Title VI-B), the ESEA Title I set-aside for the handicapped in State-supported schools and institutions (P.L. 89-313), vocational education programs for the handicapped (VEA Amendments of 1968), and special education manpower development (VEA, Title VI-D).

The study of the Aid to States program indicated that it has contributed to the expansion of State services, programs, and mandates for serving handicapped children. The most effective component of the program was the administrative set-aside which increased the planning capability. Less effective was the project component which failed to show a multiplier effect.

The study of the Title I set-aside for the handicapped in State-supported schools and institutions is still on-going. A Phase I report indicates considerable inconsistency in the allocation of funds for different handicapping conditions and in the volume of services provided by different states and regions.

The study of the vocational education programs for the handicapped found that the set-asides,to the extent utilized,have resulted in projects which would never had occurred without them. Students and employers found the program to be working well,and better than half the students completing the courses were placed in jobs. About one third reenrolled in school and only about 15% of the completers were unemployed.

The study of the Special Education Manpower Development program found that the program was important in attracting and/or retaining about one third of the student grantees in special education. For the other grantees, already committed, the program enabled them to obtain degrees sooner, or to obtain certification in a specialty area.

As the specific program evaluations above have been completed, OE has begun to turn more of its attention to the second objective (providing information for broader planning and policy decisions). To achieve this objective, the emphasis has been on assessments of resources for sub-groups of handicapped which have special needs. In the past, for example, a study of exemplary programs for the emotionally disturbed was conducted. Currently, an assessment of resources required to serve severely handicapped children is in process. This area has received substantial public and Congressional interest, and analysis is necessary before the Federal role can be realistically defined.

4. Evaluation of Programs for Occupational and Adult Education

Occupational and Adult Education programs encompass Career, Vocational, and Adult Education. The common purpose in all of these programs is to enable each individual to select and be prepared for an appropriate occupation and to be successfully employed, thus providing the Nation with an adequately trained work force. At present, the emphasis in Career Education is an orientation to a broad range of appropriate occupations and initiation of the individual selection process. Vocational Education on the other hand concentrates on specific knowledge and training needed for selected occupations, and it includes both youths and adults. Adult Education concentrates primarily on those who are prevented from obtaining the benefits of successful employment at higher skill levels because they lack the basic language and computational skills necessary and/or a high-school diploma.

Evaluations in the Occupational and Adult area have focused so far on studies to provide data on program effects, job placement, earnings and other impact information to determine what happens to students after they complete or terminate occupational training programs.

The analysis of program effects encompasses several studies either recently completed or in process. Studies of the impact of programs authorized by the Vocational Education Act are incorporated in the Vocational Impact Project (VIP). The findings indicate that vocational students do benefit from vocational training and they do experience a little more employed time than high school graduates of the academic curriculum. However, the study also revealed that labor market conditions were a greater influence on earnings than vocational education. Still in process is a longitudinal survey of graduated seniors which will provide data for comparisons of students exposed to three types of curricula, i.e., vocational, general, and academic curricula. Findings so far indicate that the Socio-economic status (SES) of vocational/technical students is lower than either the general curricula students or the academic curricula students. On various achievement tests academic students out performed other students, while vocational/technical students slightly outperformed general students. Female students outperformed males and whites outperformed blacks in all categories. In addition to the VIP studies a two-phase evaluation of work-study programs supported under Parts G and H, VEA, is ongoing (Phase I has been completed and Phase II was begun in June 1974). Phase I findings indicate that the program is keeping kids in school by providing them with financial assistance. However, the program is not related to classwork or vocational training and students are placed primarily in unskilled blue collar and clerical jobs. Finally, in the Adult area a study of the impact of Adult Basic Education projects has recently been concluded. Although this study did not cover all aspects of the State Grant Program, a key finding was that after 16 weeks in a class, the average student gained six months in reading and from 3 to 4 months in mathematics. About one-fourth of the students tested gained a full grade or more in reading, and one-fifth gained a grade or more in mathematics during that period.

5. Evaluation of Post-Secondary Education Programs

In FY 1965 the Office of Education budget for Higher Education amounted to $555.5 million, of which less than 40% was for direct student financial assistance programs. Programs which focused upon institutional support were considered of greater importance. In FY 1974, the Office of Education budget for Post-Secondary Education 1/ amounted to over $1.6 billion of which 82.8% was available for direct student assistance. The shift in funds is indicative of the evolving Federal role. Currently, the prime Federal thrust for higher education Federal programs administrated by the Office of Education is that of enhancing equal educational opportunities to all individuals, appropriate to their capabilities and desires, by helping remove financial barriers to access.

In addition, there are two other objectives which, while they provide direct institutional support, nonetheless, are in direct support of the equal access goal. These include:

-- Several programs which are intended to provide special services to disadvantaged students to strengthen their motivation to obtain a postsecondary education both prior to and after enrollment, and

-- An institutional development thrust, supported by the Developing Institutions Program and work in the accreditation and eligibility

---

1/ Eligibility was extended to students enrolled in proprietary post-secondary institutions with the Higher Education Amendment of 1972.

area, which is intended to ensure that students entering postsecondary education obtain a quality educational experience. These three objectives then form a "continuum of assistance": contact with the disadvantaged student at the secondary school level to help him prepare for and select an institution; financial assistance to help overcome financial barriers to attend a postsecondary institution; and institutional assistance to assure not only that the institutions can provide these students with quality educational programs but special academic and other services to assist disadvantaged students to remain in and complete their programs.

a. The Enhancement of Equal Access by Removal of Financial Barriers for Students

USOE administered programs in FY 1974 accounted for only 31.3% of all Federal funds available for student assistance; however, their impact was much greater. More specifically, since Federal aid is awarded on the basis of unmet student financial need, (i.e., total student costs less parent's contribution, student earnings, veterans and Social Security benefits, state and private grants, and all other income), for many students Federal aid represents the difference between being able to attend school and not going, while other needy students are now able to attend an institution of their choice.

While it is difficult to determine precisely how many individual students benefited from Federal postsecondary assistance programs during FY 1974, there is some evidence based on available studies. 2/

2/ Most funds for programs funded in academic 1973-74 were appropriated under the FY 1973 Budget since all funds, except loan subsidies and default payments, are for programs which are forward-funded.

(1) Over two million students or one out of every five students in eligible institutions, received some type of Federal aid from an OE administered program in Academic Year 1973-74.

(2) The average award from USOE administered financial aid programs, which included grants, loans, and work-study programs was over $1,100 per student. This is equal to about 40% of the revenue required by a typical dependent student in Academic Year 1973-74. In dollar terms total revenue required averaged $2,750 per student. 3/

(3) Preliminary results of a follow-up study of borrowers under the GSLP program indicate that both access to postsecondary education and enlarged choice of insitution resulted for participating students. Over 50% of the respondents indicated that either they could not have attended college (20.7%), or the institutions they selected (30.6%), had they not participated in the program. 4/

(4) It is too early to measure the impact of the Basic Grant program at the end of FY 1974. Since Academic Year 1973-74 was the first year of funding, only a small amount ($65.0 million) was obligated the first year, and only full-time first year students were eligible. A planning study suggests that the BEOG program will enhance college-going for low-income students (the very population the program is targeted upon.5/) both with regard to access to college and to selection.

3/ Bureau of the Census, Current Population Survey, Special Drop-off Survey, October 1973.
Drop-off Survey, October 1973.

4/ RMC Research Corporation, A Survey of Lenders and Borrowers Quarterly Report, #6, December 31, 1974, Washington, D.C. (OPBE Study)

5/ Alan Wagner, "The Impact of Grant Aid on Higher Education Expenditure by Low Income Families: Some Implications of BOG's," 1974. (OPBE Special study)

b. Institutional Assistance [6]

There were two distinct types of institutional assistance programs operative in FY 1974; those that helped institutions provide specific types of services to students and the other, a more general institutional assistance which focussed upon improving the overall quality of the institution.

(1) Providing Special Services to Students

These programs were focussed upon the objective of motivating students to attend a postsecondary institution and to persist once in attendance. The intent is to ensure that the non-financial academic and social needs of disadvantaged students be considered, and assistance given where possible to assure not only a fair opportunity for the disadvantaged student to enroll in the college best suited to his needs, but also assure that once in attendance, he can obtain additional assistance if necessary to complete a program of study. The Upward Bound and Talent Search programs focus upon the precollege student while the Special Services to Disadvantaged Student program was enacted to help the College-level student. [7]

The FY 1973 Evaluation Report included the findings of two studies of the Upward Bound Program. Since there was indication that there were mixed results some success, some failure, in the findings of these two studies with regard to the impact of the Upward Bound program a major study was funded during FY 1974 to study the impact of the Upward Bound program and the operations of the Talent Search program. This is now in process.

---

[6] Institution is used in a general sense and does not necessarily refer to an educational institution.

[7] The Educational Opportunity Center Programs authorized in Higher Education Amendments of 1972 was not operative during FY 1974; the reporting period for this report.

The Special Services for Disadvantaged Students Program, unlike the pre-college Upward Bound and Talent Search Programs is intended to aid students at the postsecondary level to complete their programs of study. A major evaluation of that program was recently completed. A partial list of the findings follow: 8/

- In understanding student behavior and attitudes, race effects are more critical than poverty or physical handicap effects, with the implication that any efforts with the disadvantaged need to be particularly sensitive to the racial or ethnic backgrounds of the students served.
- Without adequate financial aid, low-income students are less likely to enter college, to succeed, or to be satisfied with their college experience. There are important differences in the degree to which financial aid of various kinds is known, available to, or used by the different racial/ethnic groups.
- The need for further research, and development activity with rigorous evaluation, is still evident--both for more definitive answers about the impact of programs, and the development of better intervention strategies. Better data, on individuals over time, needs to be routinely maintained, and more rigorous experimental designs, with better controls, need to be employed.
- The data suggest that whatever forces are in operation to equalize access to college for the poor in comparison to the non-poor, they may be working more effectively for the poor white and the poor blacks, and less effectively for the poor Orientals, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Native Americans, and other ethnic minorities.

8/ Davis, J.A., Burkheimer, G., and Borders-Patterson, Ann, The Impact of Special Programs in Higher Education for Disadvantaged Students. Princeton, N.J. : Educational Testing Service, 1975. (OPBE Study)

. The presence of Special Services Programs and/or disadvantaged students on the campuses seems to be associated with a change in campus attitude toward the disadvantaged and toward their more general acceptance and accommodation by faculty, administrators and other students.

. Of most importance, however, is the finding that the availability and/or use of Special Service programs, is not related to the success or satisfaction of the disadvantaged student in general.

(2) Providing for the improvement of the quality of the educational experience.

There are two programmatic thrusts in furtherance of this goal:

(a) Direct Financial Assistance to Institutions (primarily through the Developing Institutions Program) and

(b) Determination of Institutional Eligibility (through the activities of the Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility Staff of the Office of Education)

In brief, it follows that it is not sufficient to provide funds to students to overcome financial barriers to college attendance and success without also giving consideration to the educational experience provided by the institutions they are likely to attend.

(a) Direct Financial Assistance

The Developing Institutions Program provides grants to those institutions considered out of the mainstream (i.e., underdeveloped) and serving large numbers of educationally and economically disadvantaged. Last year's Evaluation Report outlined the findings on the most recent of several studies of this program. It suggested the program has had mixed success in helping institutions develop, however, the study only considered the impact of Federal funds on program operations and not on the broader question of equal access.

(b) Determination of Institutional Eligibility

A second program to ensure that students will receive a quality educational experience, centers around the activities of the Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility Staff (AIES) of the Office of Education. Briefly, the main function of this staff is to certify which institutions are eligible to participate in Federal education programs primarily by certifying that the private and state accreditation bodies are effectively performing their stated objectives. It is assumed that if an institution is properly accredited that it offers its students a quality educational experience. It also assumed that these private and state accrediting agencies would effectively supervise their institutions and take appropriate action if an institution did not maintain itself properly.

The role of the Office of Education and AIES then is primarily to accredit the accrediting agencies for eligibility purposes. An evaluation study 9/ of these activities urges that the Office of Education consider other alternatives. The study further suggests that other steps be taken to help the student consumer be more aware of the products being offered by postsecondary educational institutions, and that USOE program staff personnel take more positive steps to regulate their own programs.

9/ Harold Orlans, A Study of Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility, The Brookings Institution and the Academy for Public Administration, Washington, D.C., 1974. (OPBE Study)

6. Evaluation of Special Programs

The programs included in this category are, with one exception, those which have been referred to in the past as developmental programs; the exception is Indian Education. However, all of these programs can be categorized into one of two types of programs -- (1) resource development programs, and (2) programs that deal with special problems.

The categorization of these programs is not precise; that is, some components of the Library Resources program (e.g., the Public Libraries program) support projects which attempt to deal with special problems, whereas some components of the Right-to-Read Program are resource development activities. However, the programs are categorized according to their principal thrust.

In recent years, all of the above programs have been analyzed in an attempt to determine whether or not there is a Federal role, and if there is, what that role should be. With the exception of the Right-to-Read, at one time or another there has been a suggestion that there was no appropriate Federal role for any of the programs. Some have been proposed for termination on the grounds that other higher priorities require fiscal support, others have been proposed for consolidation, and one or two have been proposed for termination on the grounds that other existing programs have the authority to provide the necessary support. Finally, two of the programs (Nutrition and Health and Dropout Prevention) have been consolidated and lost their identity by legislative action in P.L. 93-380.

Teacher training programs. The OE position is that Teacher Corps will be the primary vehicle for the Federal role, although some programs for special needs areas will be continued under other authorities, e.g., bilingual education teacher training and education of Indian teachers. Since Teacher Corps is proposed to be the main vehicle for the Federal role, current and future evaluation efforts in the teacher training area focus on Teacher Corps activities. A major study of Teacher Corps sixth cycle projects (all of which were projects for pre-service training) is being completed. Findings so far indicate that the prior background and training of Teacher Corps interns is not a good predictor of teaching skills and attitudes. Rather it is the Teacher Corps training program which is closely associated with such training skills and attitudes. The study also found that program characteristics and the school and community setting were important influences on acquisition of intern skills and attitudes.

The Right to-Read-program, has been a catalytic, demonstration program intended to stimulate a national effort to eliminate functional illiteracy. As such, there was expectation that it would have impact beyond the level normally expected for a program of its size. It is anticipated that this general strategy will be continued in the future. However, the Education Amendments of 1974 (P.L. 93-380) created the National Reading Improvement Program. Though this program, as defined in the legislation, appears to be similar in goals and structure to the current Right-to-Read Program, there are some differences which may revise some current major program thrusts, e.g., the State Grants Program.

A recent study of Community-Based programs indicates that students in the program did achieve significant reading gains above the average. Similar gains were made by adults. However, adult gains required at least 100 hours of instruction before they became significant.

Over the past year, personnel in USOE library programs have been engaged in an attempt to define the future Federal role in libraries. Current thinking is that the Federal government should disengage from service support programs and focus on efforts to demonstrate new practices and maximize the impact of existing facilities and resources through development of networking relationships. Recent studies have indicated that Federal library programs have been successful in aiding the education of special target groups and that the Federal programs have stimulated State, local and private support both for public and school libraries. The studies have also indicated that the Federal presence is important in providing coordination and direction to State and local efforts.

E. Highlights of Completed Studies

During FY 1974, 20 evaluation studies were completed which provided new information about the impact or effectiveness of the programs studied. The highlights of these studies follow:

1. Evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP-II). The purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of the Emergency School Assistance Program in aiding the desegregation process. The study found that ESAP caused gains in academic achievement for black male high school students. Desegregation places a great deal of strain on students of both races, but the study found that schools can ease this strain by having a staff that supports desegregation and helping desegregation proceed smoothly. The school environment--and especially the principal's leadership--appears to be able to change the way teachers behave toward black students even if teachers' personal feelings about race are not easily changed. This study apparently represents the first time that a major evaluation of Federal education programs was carried out using the superior methodology of a randomized experimental design.

2. Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title I Programs for Migrant Children of Migrant Agricultural Workers. The purpose of this study was to meet the requirements of P.L. 92-318, the Education Amendments of 1972, which directed the Commissioner of Education to conduct a study of the effectiveness of ESEA Title I as it affects the education of migrant children. The study findings indicated that migrant students fall behind their non-migrant peers in grade level and in

academic achievement, with the lag being most marked in the third and fourth grades. The implication is that migrant students do not receive adequate training in basic reading and with math skills during the earliest years of schooling. The study also found that most migrant students drop out of school before the ninth grade. Only 40 percent enter the ninth grade and only 11 percent enter the twelfth grade in contrast to a national norm of 90 percent and 80 percent respectively. Although parents and students were satisfied with the special migrant programs at the elementary level, there were relatively few programs at grade 7-12 level and there was strong question about their number, quality, and utility. The study indicated that much improvement is needed in the area of interstate and intrastate coordination of educational programs including the use of the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) as a storage and retrieval system for information on migrant students. The funding formula also needs major improvement since the present process results in numbers of children which are likely to be undercounted in many States. The present fixed allocations of funds derived from the current formula also tends to discourage States from increasing the count of migrant children on the grounds of "dilution of services".

3. A Process Evaluation of the Bilingual Education Program, Title VII, Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The purpose of this study was to collect descriptive data about Spanish bilingual projects funded under ESEA Title VII in order to provide information for program planning as well as a basis for designing an impact study of

the bilingual program (now underway).

The findings indicate shortages of trained bilingual teachers and a lack of appropriate bilingual instructional materials. However, the often-cited shortages of bilingual materials at individual projects was difficult to reconcile with an impressive quantity of materials displayed or catalogued at the Dissemination Project for Bilingual-Bicultural Education at Austin, Texas, and at the Materials Acquisition Project at San Diego, California. It may be that there are shortcomings in the dissemination and distribution processes that need attention. Other findings indicate that although Title VII is a demonstration program, little attempt had been made to replicate projects by other SEAs and LEAs. There was good informal exchange of information between projects, including visits, but project directors felt the need for more technical assistance during the time that the bilingual program was being implemented.

4. The Demand for Facilities in the Postsecondary Sector 1975 to 1990. The purpose of this study was to determine the need for postsecondary facilities in the near future. The report finds there is no crisis in postsecondary facilities. If the study's low student enrollment projection materialized there will be adequate facilities to 1975 and only minimal additions required after that to meet the 1980 peak in enrollments. If the study's high projection materializes, modest additions to space at roughly one and a half to two-thirds the current rate of commitment will be required after 1975.

5. A Study of Title III of the Higher Education Act: The Developing Institution Program. The purpose of this study was to identify in-

dicators of institutional development which could be useful for determining award eligibility and to provide data on use of program funds for improvement in curriculum, faculty, administration, and student services in developing institutions.

The study identified four states of institutional growth--1) the undeveloped institutional (small, weak, financially troubled); 2) the institution with potential for growth (rational basis for expansion, promising financial condition, no major areas of deficiency); 3) the growing institution (sense of identity and mission, viable size, financial stability; and 4) the self-contained institution (competent faculty and administration, financial stability, variety of disciplinary offerings, receptive to community and student needs). These characteristics are important in making judgments about awards.

The study findings also indicated that the size of the grant was not significantly related to its impact on the programmatic development of the institution. Continuity of funding produced greater gains than intermittent funding at higher levels. Presidential leadership has an important influence on grant impact.

6. Evaluation of the Special Services Programs for Disadvantaged Students in Higher Education. The purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of the SSDS program. The study covered 12,000 students in 120 colleges and universities. These included both disadvantaged students of poverty origin and "regular" students in these institutions. Some of these institutions had the Federally-supported SSDS

program, some had similar intervention programs funded by non-Federal sources, and others had no program but had disadvantaged students in sufficient numbers to allow comparisons with the other two groups of colleges.

The study found no evidence that the disadvantaged students were exceeding the level of performance, as measured by college grades, that would be expected if they had not experienced the program. Racial-ethnic group differences and institutional effects were found to have more influence on performance than program effects. Disadvantaged student success at SSDS-sponsoring colleges was no greater nor no less than colleges without these programs. However, the program was successful in improving participant expectations to persist in college. It also improved their attitudes about academic and social success in college.

7. A Study of College Students. The purpose of this study was to continue analysis of the Current Population Surveys of the Census Bureau, in order to determine how student access to institutions of higher education has changed during the past seven years and also to determine likely enrollment patterns. For example, the data reveals that full-time college participation rates declined sharply between 1969 and 1972 with the sharpest decline being in all family income classes below $15,000.

8. Private Accrediting and Public Funding. The purpose of this study was to examine the current accreditation process as a basis for establishing eligibility for Federal programs. The study found many problems with the process, including: a lack of assurance about the integrity of many colleges despite regional accreditation, least satisfactory methods in the proprietory sector, and lack of protection of student interests by accrediting agencies. The study that alternative methods should be considered, and also that more attention should be given to

enlarging the State role in this process as well. In addition, the authors recommend that more detailed performance or output information for all eligible institutions be made available for use by potential student consumers.

9. Interest Subsidy and Loan Default Model. The purpose of this study was to further develop and refine the Interest Subsidy and Loan Default Model which was developed to allow for a more accurate estimate of costs for planning and budgetary purposes. Equally beneficial was an historical analysis of the characteristics of borrowers and lenders. This analysis produced the most detailed profile of lenders, borrowers, and defaulters ever available for use by USOE. As a result, the types of borrowers and institutions most likely to contribute to the default problem were identified, and the scope and depth of the default problem became clearly evident for the first time to policymakers at all levels of government.

10. The Federal College Work-Study Program:

The purpose of this study was to: 1) provide detailed information on program and institutional participants; and 2) determine the effectiveness of CWS program objectives. The most important finding was that the primary goal of helping students from low-income families meet their postsecondary educational costs was being achieved. However, only 25 percent of those students working were in career or course-related activities, and although this is a secondary,not binding goal, the program could be more effective in this regard.

11. Special Rate Allowances and Servicing Costs. The purpose of this study was to analyze for the Guaranteed Student Loan Program the the historical relationship between costs of money to lenders, actual Special Rate Allowances (SRA) set by the existing method, and the hypothetical SRA under a new method in which the SRA would be tied to an index of 90 or 180-day Treasury bills. The study also investigated the components of loan servicing by several different types of lending institutions and the actual costs of these servicing functions. The report made recommendations on both the method for determining the SRA, the feasibility of fixing a separate loan servicing fee, and other administrative aspects of the Guaranteed Student Loan Program.

12. Assessment of Vocational Education Programs for Handicapped Students. The purpose of this study was to examine how well the program was functioning. The study covered 25 States and 92 projects. Major findings include: planning was primarily short-term, generally toward justifying projects; 93 percent of the funds were spent on direct services to handicapped students, and administrators agreed that, without the Part B set aside, very little vocational programming for the handicapped would exist. Two-thirds of the training was in non-skill training programs which were not intended to prepare students to compete in the labor market; many were in pre-vocational programs. However, one-half of the programs did have a work experience component although few "jobs" were training-related. While "mainstreaming" was the general policy, 70 percent of the students were in special classes.

The placement rate was good for men; women were paid less, worked less. Occupational ranges for women students were very narrow, most were trained in home economics, primarily non-gainful, and health services. In the case studies of five States in which students, completers, and their parents were interviewed, nearly all indicated that they were well satisfied. Dissatisfaction existed primarily with those in sheltered workshops or institutions. Participating employers gave high ratings to handicapped personnel in nearly all work categories. However, non-participating employers were fearful that they would have to make many changes in their work stations (most were changes that participating employers did not feel were necessary).

13. Assessment of the Needs of Handicapped Children from Low Income Families. The purpose of this study was to assess briefly the interactive effects on a child who is both handicapped and from a low income family through a comprehensive review and analysis of the literature. The review determined that 1) very few studies have taken as their principal focus the educational needs of low income, handicapped children; 2) though there is somewhat more information on the frequency of handicapping conditions in low income children, data are insufficient for Federal planning purposes; 3) the contractor was unable to discover any studies of educational programs specifically designed for low income, handicapped children.

14. Evaluation of an Aid-to-States Program for Education of Handicapped Children. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the effectiveness of the various legislative components of the State Grant Program.

The study indicated that EHA-B has contributed to the expansion of State services, programs and mandates for serving handicapped children. The most effective component appeared to be the administrative set aside of EHA-B which increased capability for planning programs at the SEA level. Less effective was the project component of EHA-B; although project grants permitted local districts to develop innovative programs which would not otherwise occur, the impact of that innovation was largely restricted to the particular district which received the grant. There was not a significant replication impact in other districts which did not receive EHA-B funds. The study hypothesized that the failure of EHA-B to produce a multiplier effect could be traced to the nature of fiscal support provided by the EHA legislation. The certainty of receiving a continuing and "non-matching" Federal grant lessens the probability that local districts will undertake such projects on their own. Consequently, EHA has little effect on changing local priorities in the allocation of non-Federal resources.

A second problem identified is that the EHA-B per capita formula does not take into account the marked differences among States and local governments in their ability to pay for programs for handicapped children. Thus, the formula does not correct the existing situation whereby a child's chance of receiving appropriate services depends largely on where his family lives.

15. Assessment of School-Supervised Work Education Programs.

The purpose of the study was to examine the different configiruations of work education program to determine whether they are meeting their intended objectives. A stratified random sample of 50 work education sites indicated that cooperative education programs appear to be generating the most enthusiasm among students, employers and school officials because they meet the expressed needs and objectives of all groups. They were more likely to: provide students with job-related instruction; provide job placement services and have a high rate of job-related placements; and help students decide on an occupation. However, they were more apt to discriminate against students on the basis of student attitudes and more likely to restrict their offerings to students with rather conforming, middle-class behaviors. Work study programs appear to be meeting their basic objective which is to keep students in school by providing them with financial assistance. However, the report indicates, many work study students were placed in "rather boring deadend jobs that didn't challenge their capabilities, gave them no real appreciation for the world of work and failed to allow them to explore career interests of their own."

16. Evaluation of the Availability and Effectiveness of MDTA Institutional Training and Employment Services for Women.

The purpose of the study was to determine how effective the MDTA program was in serving the needs of women. The report provided findings from three sources: Re-analysis of data from the MDTA Outcome Study; a review of the literature; and case studies of 12 skills centers. Female trainees were generally being trained in the same occupation of their last full-time job, health-related and clerical/sales occupations. There was evidence of stereotyping in the training placement of female enrollees -- from the personnel involved in the training program and the female trainees themselves. However, follow-up data indicate that females were far more likely than males to use their acquired training in post-training employment (62% of females vs. 39% males.) Male trainees had more job alternatives available to them and were therefore less dependent on the training program. However, "female" occupations were generally below $2.00 per hour, while typically male occupations paid more than $2.50 per hour. This fact is of particular importance since the females in training were more likely than males: (1) to have dependent children; (2) to be separated or divorced, and thus be the primary support of the household.

17. The Future of Educational Telecommunications: A Planning Study. The purpose of the study was to examine the future of educational telecommunications, including such separate delivery media as public television, instructional television, and educational radio. The study found that:

. Public Television will probably continue to develop as an alternative to commercial broadcasting, providing both a cultural and informal educational milieu. Since TV production is extremely expensive, the cost can only be tolerated through enormous audiences.

The study suggested that first priority should be given to the continued development of the distribution network, including such capabilities as color transmission, videotape recorders, and "slave" transmitters.

- Instructional TV will best develop with internal cable distribution coupled with a variety of terminal recording equipment. This pattern does not fit what is currently permissable under EBFP.

- Educational Radio can expand its limited coverage by having each ETV station also operate a radio facility. The study also recommended that a minimum radio facility standard include high fidelity stereo transmission and that the requirements which prohibit support to stations with part-time or shared personnel be revised.

The report concluded that the potential of educational broadcasting has been demonstrated.

If only limited resources continue to be available, they must be allocated to produce the maximum impact. Primary emphasis must be focused on extended and improved transmission, while the funding of production capabilities must be balanced between the need for pools of talent and equipment and the desire for local activity.

18. Adult Basic Education. The purpose of this study was to assess the effects of the program on participants. The study of the Federally-funded Basic Education Program provided evidence that adults from 18 to 44 years of age with about 9 or less years of school do learn reading and math as well or better than expected over a given period of instruction. Most ABE classes met in school buildings two evenings per week for an average of three hours per session and were taught by certificated teachers who had received additional training for working with adults and who did this only part-time. The participants reported their instruction had helped them get better jobs.

19. Evaluation of Community-Based Right-To-Read Program. The purpose of this study was to evaluate a random sample of 24 Community-Based Right-to-Read projects drawn from the FY 1974 population of 73 funded projects. Thirteen of the sampled projects serve "in-school" youth and eleven projects serve "out-of-school" adults. The evaluation objectives were: (1) to measure the improvement in reading achievement; and (2) to analyze the relationships between achievement and program, staff, and adult participant characteristics.

The findings indicate that 66% of the schools sampled showed at least one month gain for each month of instruction, with 20% showing gains of 1.5 above for each month of instruction. Most successful reading gains took place in individualized learning situations using such techniques as tutors, teacher-aides, programmed learning, etc. In general, minority students (Black, Chicano and Indian) did not achieve gains to the same degree as white students.

20. Evaluation of the Library Services and Construction Act Services to Special Target Groups.

The purpose of this study was to assess how well the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) has met the library needs of special clientele groups, i.e., the economically disadvantaged, ethnic minorities, the handicapped, and institutional persons. The findings and conclusions of the study are diverse, but not surprisingly, the study found that:

a. Characteristics of successful/model projects include:
   - adequate resources, e.g., personnel committed to the target group, appropriate facilities and materials
   - State and/or local matching funds with a requirement to increase State/local support as Federal suppport decreases
   - involvement of the target group in planning and providing the services
   - adequate accessibility of the services to the target population, e.g., convenient hours, transportation, publicity, etc.

b. Special clienteles are unlikely to be served without a legislative mandate, i.e., State/local policy makers endorse equal access but do not necessarily see that some clienteles do not have equal access without extra effort by service providers.

c. The report also found that:
   - More projects are successful than unsuccessful, and fairly significant numbers of special clientele groups have been reached. However, many important needs are not

> being met, or are barely being met, even by projects judged successful.
>
> In many states it was evident that if Federal funds were not available, there would be few projects whatsoever for special clienteles. LSCA funds have been a critical factor in projects for special clienteles, and have provided the bulk of the funds being used for innovative projects..."

F. Studies in Process

In addition to those studies that were completed during FY 1974, over 30 other studies were in process. Following are brief descriptions of these studies:

1. Analysis of State Title I Evaluation Reports. This study is analyzing and synthesizing the State Title I Evaluation Reports for Fiscal Years 1971-74, in order to: (1) assess their quality; (2) depict changes over the years (including Fiscal Years 1965-70); and, (3) to use this information, in part to develop new and improved reporting systems which will yield comparable data at the State and local levels.

   Contractor: Research Management Corporation, Los Altos, California

2. Evaluation of Title I Program for Neglected and Delinquent Children. P.L. 89-750 amended ESEA Title I to provide "payments on account of neglected or delinquent children." Payments go to State agencies which use the money to conduct programs designed to meet the special educational needs of these children. In FY 73, over $38 million was allocated under this program and approximately 130,000 children were served. The only analysis of the characteristics of the program was done in 1970. This analysis was part of a larger study on selected subgroups of pupils which resulted from the 1968-69 OE Compensatory Education Survey. Thus the N&D program remains the only major program under Title I which has not been evaluated comprehensively at the national level. However such an evaluation was initiated in FY 74 and will be continued in FY 75.

   Contractor: Phase I: Marshall Kaplan, Gans and Kahn, San Francisco, Calif.
   Phase II: Subject to competitive bidding.

3. Development of Project Information Packages. The "packaging" study is addressing several problem areas identified by previous OPBE studies that attempted to identify successful projects in compensatory education. First, these studies revealed that there were no commonly-accepted criteria for identifying an exemplary project. Second, there was no systematic effort or systematic mechanism for disseminating information about those projects in a format that would be useful to practicing educators. Third, there was little evidence (with few exceptions) of successful attempts at replication of exemplary projects.

Consequently, this study had the following major objectives: (1) development of criteria for identifying exemplary projects; (2) identification of up-to-eight exemplary projects in compensatory education; (3) design of a project model and of a Project Information Package ("PIP") for each exemplary project; and (4) actual "packaging" of each exemplary project.

A total of six projects have been identified on the basis of the criteria developed and have been "packaged" for replication in the field. There has also been considerable interest in and dissemination of information about the process developed under this contract for identifying exemplary projects, and about the design considerations used in conceptualizing and developing the PIP's themselves.

Contractor: RMC Research Corp., Los Altos, Calif.

4. Evaluation of the Field Test of Project Information Packages. Relatively few successful approaches in compensatory education have been identified and fewer yet have been successfully replicated at other sites. This effort examines the process by which successful education projects are replicated via a packaged model and will determine the viability of replicating exemplary projects in other school districts through the use of a Project Information Package. Results of the study will be useful in the formulation of strategies for the dissemination of successful education practices and products.
Contractor: Standord Research Institute, Menlo Park, Calif.

5. Evaluation of the Impact of the Bilingual Education Program. This evaluation consists of three studies. The major study is an impact assessment of the Spanish-language projects in the bilingual education program under ESEA Title VII. There will be pre- and post-testing of approximately 11,000 students at 35 Title VII sites and 10 sites of other OE programs supporting Spanish bilingual projects. There will also be classroom observations and questionnaires as part of the effort to assess the impact of Title VII on participating students. These activities will be implemented during the 1975-76 school year after a planning phase during the current (1974-75) school year.

The other two studies are: 1) the study of projects involving Native-American, Indo-European, Asian and Pacific Language groups which is exploring the issues, problems and accomplishments of Title VII projects for students with home languages other than Sapnish and 2) the "exemplary study which is identifying and describing successful projects funded under Title VII or other OE-managed programs for school children. Both activities are being implemented during the 1974-75 school year.

Contractor: The American Institute for Research Palo Alto California

6. Evaluation of Compensatory Reading Programs. This study is assessing the effectiveness of Compensatory Reading Programs supported by Title I and other sources of funds available for economically disadvantaged students. The impact on students' reading skill attainment and attitudes towards reading are being examined as well as the cost of services.

   Contractor: Educational Testing Service Princeton, New Jersey

7. ESAA Pilot Program Evaluation. The Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) authorizes in Sec. 706(b) a Pilot Projects Program designed to support "unusually promising pilot programs or projects designed to overcome the adverse effects of minority group isolation by improving the academic achievement of children." The primary objective of this study is to evaluate the long-term impact of the ESAA Pilot Program on a nationally representative sample of children in minority isolated schools in terms of their reading and mathematics achievement. The relationship between impact and policy-relevant input and process variable will be investigated in an attempt to determine variables that can be manipulated to improve the likelihood of program success.

   Contractor: System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, California.

8. Evaluation of the ESAA Basic Grants Program. The objectives of this study are: 1) to determine the overall effectiveness of the program in achieving goals and objectives specified in the Emergency School Aid Act; 2) to determine the relative effectiveness of different activities funded under the General LEA Grants Program and 3) to examine the conditions under which activities are effective

   Contractor: System Development Corporation Santa Monica California

9. Further Analysis of ESAP-II Evaluation Data. The objectives of this analysis are to clarify some selected issues regarding the tenth grade students raised by the evaluation report of the second year of ESAP This includes further work in exploring the causes of higher black male achievement in ESAP high schools and the reasons for the lack of any such results for black females.

   Contractor: Rand Corporation, Santa Monica Calif.

10. Identification of Exemplary Desegregated Schools and Evaluation of Determinants of Success. The purpose of this study is to identify school programs policies and practices that contribute most to achieving and maintaining exemplary desegregated schools. One of the major final products will be a handbook describing such effective programs policies and practices in non-technical language (although it will be based upon technical analysis plus site visits to schools) for use by principals superintendents and other educational policy makers

    Contractor: Educational Testing Service Princeton,N.J.

11. Longitudinal Study of Innovative Programs. This is a detailed study of the effects of large scale, intensive innovative efforts on the achievement and motivational levels of the same students over a three year period. Most programs were initially supported by Title III ESEA and involve some 21,000 students in 15 school districts

    Contractor: American Institutes for Research Palo Alto, Calif.

12. Evaluation of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This evaluation will assess the effectiveness of Title IV programs regulations and guidelines, describe the activities and services provided by Title IV projects, and assess the utility of Title IV training and technical assistance as viewed by the school district personnel receiving assistance from Title IV projects.

    Contractor: Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California

13. Further Study of Performance Contracting in Education.

Previous studies have shown disappointing results in the short run in improving achievement in the basic skills through performance contracting. This study will look at longer-run results, including "change-agent" effects that may persist beyond the contracting period, and review current performance contracting programs in California and Michigan, where considerable successes have been reported .

Contractor: Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey

14. A Study of Change Agent Programs. Education Change Agent Programs are sponsored by the Federal Government to introduce or spread innovative practices at the local school district level (i.e. Right to Read, Titles III and VII of ESEA Vocational Education Act Part D). These Change Agent Programs normally offer temporary Federal funding. If an innovation is successful it is assumed that the district will continue and disseminate part or all of the project using other funding sources. This study is designed to determine what characteristics of the programs themselves, the innovations they support, or the districts that adopt them that lead to successful implementation and continuation.

Contractor: Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif.

15. A Study of the Impact of Student Financial Aid Programs, Phase II

The purpose of this study is to determine what happens to institutions of post-secondary education and their students when they receive federal student aid. Consideration will be given the kinds and amounts of federal aid, possible student responses and institutional policy changes. Part I: Design Study was awarded to the Higher Education Research Institute in July 1974 to be completed by March 1975. The contract for Part II: Data Collection and Analysis will be awarded in Spring 1975 for initial data collection in Fall 1975.

Contractor: Higher Education Research Institute, Los Angeles, California

16. Evaluation of the Talent Search and Upward Bound Programs

This study will be completed early in 1975. The evaluation of Talent Search is primarily descriptive: review and assessment of program operating methods and objectives, adequacy of project monitoring and validation of program output statistics. Conclusions will be drawn of program accomplishments and weakness and recommendations made for program improvement. The Upward Bound study is an impact evaluation of program participants in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades. This study uses a control group of high school students so that valid conclusions can be drawn about program effects such as high school retention and graduation and college entrance. Recommendations will be made for program improvement.

Contractor: Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.

17. A Survey of Lenders and Borrowers Under the Guaranteed Student Loan Program. This study is expected to produce a broad variety of information on aspects of loan disbursement and repayment not currently collected from both lenders and borrowers. Over 750 lenders and 5600 borrowers will be surveyed.

Contractor: Resource Management Corporation

18. Data Analyses - Loan Estimation Model. These analyses will primarily be focussed on regulatory or consumer protection issues, that is, the identification and further profiling of data relating to default collection and possible institutional fraud. It is believed that these analyses will provide further clarification and detail concerning what types of institutions and students account for significant proportions of Guaranteed Student Loan claims. They will also indicate the characteristics of those defaulters who are brought back into repayment through collection efforts.

Contractor: Systems Group, Inc., Washington, D.C.

19. A Three Phase Study of Student Revenues and Costs

The objectives of this study are: (1) to analyze the impact of the Basic Grants Program relative to the Supplementary Educational grants program on different types of students and at different levels of funding, (2) to analyze the differences which exist among alternate ways of viewing institutional costs, and (3) to analyze the allocation of campus-based federal student aid funds among different types of institutions.

Contractor: The College Entrance Examination Board
Washington, D. C.

20. Cooperative Education

The purpose of the study is to determine to what extent and in what ways the purported goals of Cooperative Education affect each of the components of Cooperative Education students, institutions, and employers. Answers are being pursued to questions concerning Cooperative Education effectiveness on student financial aid, more effective learning, career education, etc. Methodology for the study includes a survey of literature, a small number of site visits and a questionnaire to Cooperative and Non-Coop students and graduates.

Contractor: CONSAD, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania

21. A Comprehensive Study of the National Defense Student Loan Program

Due to contractual difficulities (the contract was over a year behind schedule), the study was terminated. Although some preliminary information was made available, no conclusive results can be drawn from the findings at this time. If the data base can be reclaimed, it may be possible to re-analyze the data.

Contractor: Educational Testing Service

22. Vocational Analysis of First Year Follow-up Data of the National Longitudinal Study of the H.S. Class of 1972. This study, which is part of a national longitudinal study of high school seniors is aimed at assessing what is currently known about vocational program impact, and how well the State grant mechanism functions to implement the priorities of the 1968 Amendments. The study also is providing information on the career patterns of high school graduates in the years immediately following their graduation and the factors offecting those career patterns. A national survey is also under way to provide a quantitative description of vocational students outcomes and services.

Contractor: Educational Testing Service; Princeton, New Jersey

23. Development of Evaluation Model for Career Education. Previous work evaluated Federally funded exemplary career education projects (Part D, VEA). The first evaluation model in career education was developed and is currently being field-tested by project evaluators in each of the States. Since the exemplary projects can be regarded as prototypes of career education the revised evaluation model gives promise of much wider applicability.

Contractor: Development Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C.

24. Project Metro: Effectiveness Data for Major City Secondary Education Systems. Project Metro was designed to examine vocational education practices and outcomes in twenty-two large cities. The first report was completed in the spring of 1974. The final report, will present and discuss further survey findings for the Class of 1970 academic and general program graduates. The findings will be presented in terms of such independent variables as school district population, individual cities, type of curriculum, race and sex.

Contractor: Educational Systems Research Institute, Inc.

25. Longitudinal Impact Study of the Sixth Cycle Teacher Corps Program. This is a study of the Teacher Corps program to identify the impacts of the program on institutional change, trainee development, and classroom student performance.. The study is based on a sample of all sixth cycle programs and is aimed at providing useful information on program outcomes and operations for program decision-makers.

Contractor: Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corporation, Berkeley, California

26. Adult Education Special Projects. A study has been initiated to explore the national need for adult education and to determine how the AE Special Projects Program relates to this need. Since this Program has been Federally administered but will now shift to the States, special attention will be given to providing information of value to them in setting up stronger programs.

Contractor: Kirschner Associates, Inc., Albuquerque, New Mexico and Washington, D.C.

27. An Evaluation of Educational Programs in State-Operated and State-Supported Schools for Handicapped Children. This study is assessing the impact of support provided under the provisions of ESEA Title I, as amended by P.L. 89-313. Impact is being measured in terms of 1) increased resources available to the handicapped children of these institutions, 2) the degree of increased quality of education programs, 3) the degree to which children show improved outcomes, and 4) the degree to which Federal funds have a stimulator effect on State funding.

Contractor: Exotech Systems, Inc., Washington, D.C.

28. Study of Programs Serving the Profoundly Handicapped.

Severely handicapped children, including those with multiple handicaps, normally can only obtain educational services within the context of costly residential care institutions. Because of inadequate resources, many are unable to obtain any help. The objectives of this study are 1) to determine the numbers and types of severely handicapped children receiving services, 2) to identify the types of services now received, and 3) to determine the type and quantity of services now received to meet the need.

Contractor: ABT Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

29. The Federal Role in Children's Educational Television Programming

This study was designed to provide comprehensive and current information about the state of children's television (CTV) programs nationally. This effort is not intended to collect new data, but to synthesize existing data complemented by limited new acquisition activities. Areas to be studied include: the economic aspects of CTV; market and impact analysis; examination of program alternatives; and alternative communication formats.

Contractor: Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

30. Assessment of School Supervised Work Education Programs

The second phase will provide a follow-up of the original study sample to determine what happens to cooperative education and work study students, whether they get training-related jobs, whether participating in work education programs increases their earning power or enhances their career progression to a significant degree beyond the experience of students who did not participate in these programs. A sample of 30 secondary and postsecondary cooperative education programs in urban settings will document the growth, training opportunities, strategies, and significant characteristics of these programs. Findings will be related to those of the first phase.

Contractor: Olympus Research Corporation; San Francisco, California

31. National Evaluation of the Follow-Through Planned Variation Model .

The evaluation of the national Follow Through Planned Variation Experiment has as its goal to determine from among 22 different education approaches those which are most effective in improving the academic and affective gains of disadvantaged low-income children in grades K-3 as well as noting the impact on parents and school systems. The evaluation process which started in 1969, will continue as presently designed through school year 1975-76 with an interim analysis produced each year.

Contractor: Data Collection - Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, California
Analysis - Abt Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts

82. Collection and Evaluation of Measures of Functional Adult Literacy

For needs assessment and evaluation purposes the U S Office of Education is attempting to identify the best criterion-referenced measures of adult literacy. The Right-to-Read program needs to be in a position to recommend the best of such tests to adult literacy projects for the purpose of assessing reading improvement. The Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory is currently the operational headquarters for the Clearinghouse for Applied Performance Testing (CAPT). The purpose of CAPT is to establish a mechanism for rapid surfacing and accessing of applied performance testing and assessment materials for disseminating information about such materials, and for beginning to fill gaps in the availability and use of applied performance testing materials and procedures.

The purpose of this study is to capitalize on the CAPT work and to identify and evaluate the utility of all criterion reference tests of adult literacy.

Contractor: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, Oregon

G. Uses of Evaluation Studies

As indicated, over the last several years a sizeable number of evaluation studies have been initiated and the results are now beginning to become available. Although many gaps in knowledge about program effectiveness still remain to be filled,on-going and planned studies are helping close these gaps in a significant way. More importantly, however, the study results are beginning to influence legislative, budget and program management decisions. Following are some examples of the use of these studies:

1. Dissemination of information about compensatory education projects - e.g. the AIR studies widely cited in the literature - became the basis for brochures disseminated by Title I Office and 5 packages disseminated by the Right to Read Program. These are probably the best source of evidence that some things work and are among the strongest evidence cited in an HEW "White Paper" on compensatory education.

2. The findings of an evaluation of the Community-Based Right-to-Read Program conducted by Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corporation, Berkeley, California made significant contributions to the guidelines for the establishment of reading academies for adult illiterates. Legislative provision for such academies is found in Section 723, Title VII, P.L. 93-380. Following are some of the findings which are reflected in the guidelines:

a) Adult illiterates need intensive and consistent instruction over time on a one-to-one basis rather than by means of group instruction.

b) Adult illiterate reading programs must provide supportive services to facilitate consistent attendance at scheduled reading sessions. Such supportive services are transportation, child care, and referral to welfare agencies for financial aid and health care.

c) Mechanisms must provide for obtaining greater male participation in the program. Males were definitely under represented in the evaluated projects. It was found that participating males improved their reading performance as much as did female participants.

3. A study of the bilingual program found that two major problem areas in bilingual education are a severe shortage of trained teachers and a perceived lack at the project level of adequate bilingual curricular materials. These findings have had a major impact on the "capacity building" strategy in the Federal bilingual program through increased emphasis on staff development and training and on development of curricular materials. The proposed budgets in bilingual education reflect this thrust in the increased allocations for these two categories of activities.

4. A Study of the Title I Migrant Education Program emphasized problems in the current fund-allocation formula and procedure, providing impetus to the conversion to data in the Migrant Student Record Transfer System as the basis for full allocation. That conversion, authorized by P.L. 93-380, has revently been approved by OE.

5. The Project Information Packages ("PIP") study was the basis for a new experimental program approved by the Congress beginning in Fiscal Year 1975. The "Packaging" Program, will continue the cycle of identifying effective projects in compensatory education, "packaging" these projects as guidance for replication by school personnel elsewhere, and field-testing the packages for improvements prior to dissemination. Part of the funds this year will support evaluation of the second-year field test of the Packages developed in the first PIP study.

6. The several Title I "evaluations" (Belmont, AIR, etc.) have injected a degree of realism into the thinking about the compensatory education field. The evidence from the studies has dispelled some of the early assumptions about program success and generated concern about improving the program. These evaluations also have been part of the rationale for the decision to move to more concentration on basic skills.

7. A study of the ESEA Title I allocation formula forced consideration of the hard trade-offs involved in changing the formula or leaving it alone. Many alternative computations were provided Congressional Committees in their considerations of P.L. 93-380 and the study did have an influence on the final legislation.

8. An evaluation of ESAP-II established that the program had an effect on student achievement for one important segment of the target population, black high school males. The findings about successful programs (especially human relations activities) were used to provide

guidance to program officers (via program bulletins to regional offices) for the FY 74 grant application review.

9. In-house analysis of the Coleman study data - The analysis techniques developed are increasingly being used by social scientists as a way of drawing conclusions from large-scale data banks. Some of the results were used by Moynihan in early conceptions of the Family Assistance Plan and also as a rationale for establishing NIE and in developing its research agenda. The study results also influenced the initiation of the ESAP program.

10. A study of the cost of college - At a time when all indications suggested that colleges and universities were near financial disaster, the Cost of Colleges study identified the components of increasing costs as equally divided between inflation and lower productivity on the part of the faculty. Since faculty costs account for over half the cost of education, a substantial part of the increase in the cost of education could have been better controlled. The study influenced the Departmental position to allocate available resources primarily to finance students instead of institutions.

11. A Study of Special Services for Disadvantaged Students - While the full impact of the study has yet to be felt, USOE program staff has already revised program regulations to strengthen the evaluation component for individual projects. Further, suggestions for improved program operating procedures have also been included in the program guidelines.

12. Development of a Model to Study Alternative Student Aid Programs - This work and other work by small subcontractors contributed to the development of an Enrollment/Student Aid Model which was used by the Administration and Congress to project costs of the Basic Grant Program during the hearings for the Higher Education Amendment of 1972.

13. An Interest Subsidy and Default Projection Model - This study was composed of two parts, a historical analysis of program operations and development of the projection model. Impact of the study to date has been considerable. Results include:

a) Identification of the magnitude of the default problems within the agency and consequent changes in program operations, management, and staffing.

b) Use of the subject model for interest subsidy and default projections by budget officers.

c) Identification of the characteristics of the default experience by institutions, lenders, and borrowers and pinpointing of problem areas. Appropriate operational and legislative changes were included subsequently in proposed regulations for limitation, suspension and termination of lenders in GSLP.

14. A Study of the Developing Institutions Program - From this study and a series of smaller related efforts, the concept of the Advanced Institutional Development Program was advanced. Study results were also used as the program moved toward implementation. Among other

efforts, the elements of a planning and management system were defined along with the methodology for selecting institutions for the advanced program.

15. Evaluations of Performance Contracting and the Use of Incentives in Elementary Education - These studies had generally negative findings (with a few exceptions) in the sense of demonstrating educationally insignificant gains in student achievement resulting from these approaches. The findings were widely publicized and served to dampen a growing but unwarranted enthusiasm in the educational community for these approaches. It is likely that without these studies many school systems would have initiated performance contracting and/or incentive projects.

16. Analysis of Relationships Between Achievement Gains and Per Pupil Expenditures - This study failed to find evidence for the fairly wide-held notion that a "critical mass" ($300 per pupil) of compensatory education funds is necessary for significant education achievement gains among disadvantaged students. The study quieted the promotion of the critical mass position.

17. A Study of Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility - Study findings have been made available to the Federal Trade Commission and several Congressional Committees. This has aided in understanding the process establishing institutional eligibility for Federal programs and the limitations of using that process. New FTC regulation relating to proprietary institutions were developed in part with the use of

findings from this study. Also proposed legislation to perform a similar study was apparently withdrawn in light of the depth of findings in this study. The study has also provided testimony for at least three Congressional committees.

INDIVIDUAL DESCRIPTIONS
OF
OE ADMINISTERED PROGRAMS

A. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Education of Disadvantaged Children

Legislation

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended

Expiration Date:

September 30, 1977

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	$ 1,192,981,206	$ 1,192,981,206
	1967	1,430,763,947	1,053,410,000
	1968	1,902,136,223	1,191,000,000
	1969	2,184,436,274	1,123,127,000
	1970	2,523,172,905	1,339,050,900
	1971	3,457,407,[illegible]24	1,500,000,000
	1972	4,138,377,672	1,597,500,000
	1973	4,927,272,941	1,585,185,000
	1974	4,182,509,627	1,719,315,000
	1975	3,776,000,000	1,876,000,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

Section 101 of P.L. 89-10, as amended through the 90th Congress, 1st session states:

> In recognition of the specific educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local education agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in this part) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contributes particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

Administrative responsibilities for Title I are shared by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, State education agencies (SEA's), and local education agencies (LEA's). USOE: (1) determines the entitlements of counties and of State education agencies; (2) ratably reduces authorizations on the basis of Congressional appropriations; (3) distributes available funds to SEA's; (4) develops and disseminates regulations, guidelines and other materials related to administration of Title I; (5) provides monitoring and technical assistance to SEA's (6) compiles fiscal, statistical, and evaluation data; (7) evaluates the results and effectiveness of the program; and, (8) receives assurances from SEA's that programs will be administered in accordance with the law and the regulations.

Participating SEA's must assure USOE that they will administer the program in their States and submit evaluation and fiscal reports as provided in the law and regulations. Administrative functions of SEA's include: (1) approval or disapproval of proposed LEA projects; (2) suballocation of county aggregate grants to eligible LEA's; (3) provision of technical assistance to LEA's (4) maintenance of fiscal records, and (5) preparation of fiscal and evaluation reports for USOE.

In developing, proposing, implementing, and evaluating local projects, LEAs are required to identify areas impacted with high concentrations of children from low-income families, assess the special needs of children in those areas, and design projects that match available resources to identified needs. In addition to these activities, LEA's must keep adequate fiscal records and provide SEA's with annual fiscal and evaluation reports.

Title I enabling legislation and USOE regulations instituted one of the largest Federal-State-local education partnerships in the history of United States education. The legislation authorizes Federal financing of thousands of separate, autonomous, local programs operated and administered by local school boards and approved by the State. USOE's primary role is to administer the program without exercising direction, supervision or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration or personnel of any educational institution, school, or school system. The intent of the law is to let local educational agencies--the agencies that are most acutely aware of the unique needs of local educationally deprived children--design and implement projects that will match available resources to local needs.

USOE's strategy for administration and operation of Title I at the State level has been to monitor those activities and provide technical assistance to the States as required. Similarly, monitoring and technical assistance activities are the responsibility of SEA's and are meant to insure LEA compliance with the letter and intent of Title I regulations. USOE's monitoring and technical assistance activities are a major component of the effort to improve ESEA Title I program operations at the State and local levels.

Improvement of local project impact on participating students is the goal of two additional strategies, namely, SEA project development/evaluation technical assistance, and USOE identification, validation, packaging and replication of local projects that have demonstrated their effectiveness for children. SEA's are granted up to one percent of the total State Title I allocation or $150,000, whichever is greater, to monitor and provide technical assistance to LEA's.

Program Scope

For the 1971-1972 school year the Consolidated Program Information Report (CPIR) indicated that 5,946,930 children enrolled in public and private schools* participated in Title I programs operated by local agencies. This represents approximately 12 percent** of all students enrolled in elementary and secondary education in the U.S. and roughly one-fourth of the school-age children residing in school districts that have at least one Title I eligible school.

Ninety-five percent of the above Title I participants were public school students. The remainder (some 5 percent) were non-public school students who were participating in public school operated Title I programs. These latter students also represent approximately 5 percent of all non-public school students enrolled in elementary and secondary education. The public school enrollees participating in Title I represent 12 percent of the total public school enrollment.

---

* This includes schools in districts for which the district has a total enrollment of more than 300 students.

** This represents a slight underestimate since the base uses 1970 Census data and enrollments have declined slightly since then.

Although Title I funds reach only 12% of the students in the U.S. they involve a much greater proportion of schools and school districts. Of some 89,372 elementary and secondary public schools in the U.S., Title I funds are received by about 52 percent of them. Similarly, of roughly 18,142* such non-public schools, some 33 percent have one or more students participating in Title I supported programs. About 60 percent of all public school districts in the U.S. receive Title I funds.

The CPIR** also indicated that of the 306,594 children of Migratory agricultural workers, almost 76 percent participated in Title I supported Migrant programs. For some 45 percent of these participants, their migratory status was interstate in nature.

A recent survey of state operated institutions for neglected and delinquent children showed that in FY '71 some 91 percent of 5,500 resident neglected children and some 96 percent of 50,000 resident delinquent children participated in Title I supported programs† (Neglected or Delinquent Children Living in State Operated or Supported Institutions Fiscal Year 1971, NCES, 1974).

A total of 68,158 parents of children participating in Title I activities were involved in school district level advisory committees. A comparable figure for school level advisory committees is 87,600 parents. However, the greatest level of involvement is at the Title I project level with 446,835 parents of participating children being involved in project related activities‡.

Program Effectiveness

Two recent studies[1/] indicated that Title I allocation procedures provided additional funds to school districts with the greatest financial need (Berke and Kirst, 1972; Johns, et. al. 1971). The latter of these two studies indicated that in the sample of districts studied, those with greatest financial need also had the greatest educational need, as evidenced by their pupil achievement test performance.

---

* These figures are for the 1970-71 school year.

** the CPIR universe data.

† Roughly 60 percent of the funds were expended for instruction in basic skills.

‡ These data are also obtained from the CPIR for the 1971-72 school year. Since a parent can be involved at more than one level, these figures are not mutually exclusive.

Debate about the overall effect of Title I on the achievement of participants appears to be diminishing as a better understanding develops of some of the general evaluation of issues involved. When complete and thorough evaluation procedures are adhered to and when test results are purged of the systematic artifacts introduced by the practices of test manufacturers, remarkably effective projects can be identified. When these two conditions are not present, as they seldom are, no useful statements can be made concerning performance of the project at the individual level, nor at a more aggregate level. However, other data sources indicate that economically disadvantaged children, in the aggregate, still perform well below their advantaged peers. Children of migratory agricultural workers fall progressively further behind their non-migrant peers and drop out of school at an alarmingly high rate at the higher grade levels. These conclusions are expanded in the following paragraphs.

Though local Title I projects may encompass a wide variety of objectives, information from the CPIR indicates that 62% of Title I funds were spent for direct educative services (namely, language arts, culture, social sciences, vocational skills and attitudes). Slightly more than half of these latter funds were used to support programs aimed specifically at improving the reading skills of the participants (National Center for Educational Statistics, Bulletin No. 19, July 12, 1974). Given this programmatic emphasis, it seems fair to regard improvement in reading skills as the best single indicator of program effectiveness, especially in the elementary grades. Indeed, most of the evaluative evidence in the individual State and local evaluation reports is comprised of reading test scores (Wargo, et al., 1972; Planar, 1973; Tallmadge, et al., 1974).

There are two main sources of information on the effectiveness of reading projects: (1) national studies sponsored by OPBE; and, (2) State and local evaluation reports. For the first category, the results of two major studies are just now becoming available and some discussion will be devoted to them. For the latter category, partial results of a newly initiated study concerning what can be learned from recent State and local reports and how they might be improved will be discussed.

The first study dealt with the effects of compensatory reading programs on student reading skill acquisition for a nationally representative sample of elementary schools. One aspect of the study attempted to give a brief historical overview, from extant data, of the growth in reading skills of students over the past half century. The conclusions of this effort were that students of today are more able in their reading skills, as judged by their performance on standardized reading tests, than were their counterparts of 20 years ago or earlier and that there was a gradual improvement in reading skills over the forty year period prior to 1965 (Farr, et al., 1974). During the past decade this trend has ceased and a very slight decline may even have set in.* Possible explanations for this decline were not given. However, the cumulative effects of television and a relaxation of the degree of structure of the curriculum through open classrooms, individualized lesson plans and projects, etc. should be considered. A second aspect of this study showed that there were substantial differences among the 710 schools studied in the ways they approach compensatory reading and that it is possible to categorize the various approaches in meaningful ways (Rubin, et al., 1973). The third aspect of this study deals with the effects of programs in 260 of these schools on their participants using pre and post measures of reading skill, and the relative costs of these efforts. Although only preliminary results are available on this latter phase a number of unusually effective programs have been identified. However, they do not typify any single approach and the nature of their effect is usually more pronounced at the lower or at the higher grade levels rather than being consistently effective at all of the grade levels studied (Trismen, et al., 1975).** As of this writing their costs do not appear to be different from many other approaches to reading, however, corroboration of this point must await the results of the complete data analysis (Dieneman, et.al., 1974). An earlier study did find a modest positive relationship between Title I per-pupil expenditures and achievement gains for reading projects in California schools that had heavy concentrations of disadvantaged children. However, there, was no evidence for the existence of a "critical mass" of compensatory expenditures such that expenditures above a certain level resulted in pronounced improvements in reading (Tallmadge, 1973).

A second national study sought to identify, validate and package up to 8 effective approaches to compensatory education so that schools in other locales could duplicate the projectsby working directly from the package (Tallmadge, October 1974). Some 2000 projects were considered as potential candidates for packaging. Initial screening on three criteria reduced this number to 136. The three criteria were that the program had to: emphasize reading or math benefits; be oriented toward disadvantaged children; and, be evaluated more than once. Of the 136 survivors, detailed descriptive information could be obtained on only 103. Fifty-four percent of these were rejected due to inadequate evidence of effectiveness as determined by an exceptionally rigorous examination which included independent analyses of project raw data and on-site visitations. Hence, six projects were selected and their specific implementation requirements were packaged in what have come to be called "Project Information Packages" (PIP's). These six packages are now being field tested to see if results in other sites can be produced which are comparable to those of their original site.*

---

* For corroboration of a comparable trend in England see Start (1972).

** Somewhat similar results were found in a study of Follow-Through classrooms by Stallings (1974).

When the effectiveness data for the above projects were being carefully validated (Tallmadge and Horst, 1974), some heretofore unrecognized effects of the practices of test manufacturers were revealed. Since these effects are dramatic in nature and have profound implications for the conduct of all evaluations they will be dealt with in some detail here.

Many test manufacturers obtain their "norm" data (namely. data on how a nationally representative sample of students perform on the test) during the middle of the academic year, about February. For many purposes including program evaluation, however, norms are desired so that one can gauge their students' standing relative to other students at the beginning and at the end of the school year. To fulfill this need the manufacturers usually create "synthetic" norms by drawing a smoothed curve through the average or median scores for consecutive grade levels. This curve is then assumed to represent the growth throughout the academic year for a typical or average student. However, students do not grow according to this kind of a curve. They may forget a great deal over the summer and may learn more during some periods of the year than others. Consequently, this smoothing procedure introduces systematic artifacts which can produce some of the following results depending upon the grade level involved: (a) project students can show better than month for month gains yet never catch up with their more advantaged peers; (b) project students are virtually precluded from showing month for month gains or better since the typical or average student only gains two-thirds of a month per month. In addition, some test publishers break the nine month academic year up into three equal segments with all of the growth occuring between segments. For example, starting with September 1st as the beginning of the school year, three months of growth would occur between November 30th and December 1st and another three months of growth would occur between February 28 and March 1st. As a result of these kinds of synthetic norms, a program that administers its pre-test late in the Fall and then post-tests early in the Spring will show more month per month growth than a program that tests early in the Fall and late in the Spring, even though the latter program might be considerably more effective than the former. Finally, the use of grade equivalent scores, rather than standard scores or percentiles, was shown to systematically distort the amount of growth even when real norms were available for the time period under consideration. As a result projects can be judged effective and worthy of dissemination when they aren't and project participants can be judged as catching up with their more privileged counterparts when they aren't. Or alternatively, on occasion effective projects can be rejected as being ineffective. The antidote to all this is to use only those tests which have real norms appropriate for the time interval under study (e.g., real Fall and real Spring norms) and to base the evaluation on standard scores and express the results in percentile ranks.*

---

* For more details on the nature of the field test see the evaluation projects described under ESEA Title III.

Early in FY '73 legislative activities suggested that Title I would retain its identity even if consolidation were to occur. Therefore, a study was initiated to see what could be learned from a critical examination of the information in recent State Title I reports (FY's 71-74), how such results might have changed when compared with earlier years (FY's 69-70 in Wargo, et.al., 1972) and, to see how State reporting systems might be improved.** Results from the first phase of this study, which is concerned with the review of current and past reports, shows that most continue to show a number of serious shortcomings which precludes their usefulness in making statements about the achievement benefits of project participants at the state level. Most reports do not contain statistically representative data and the unrepresentative achievement data which is presented is almost always expressed in terms of grade level equivalent gains. The data are unrepresentative because many LEAs do not get their reports in on time to be used in the State's report and of those that do, the data are often incomplete and non-representative.* Hence, in preparing his report the State evaluator is forced to rely only on the available data and this is a biased subset. of all LEA projects and their participants.** Almost all of the States report their achievement benefits in grade equivalent gains--a metric that capitalizes on artifacts introduced by the practices of test manufacturers, as outlined earlier. The latter part of the study will focus on how these other problems might be overcome.

---

* For example, by virtue of project participation students moved from the 15th percentile on the pre-test to the 30th percentile on the post-test.

** The new Title I evaluation requirements as set forth in the Educational Amendments of 1974 (P.L. 93-380) make this project one of highest priority.

At the individual project level then, some highly successful efforts can be isolated. Usually, however, evaluation evidence is not adequate to permit judgments about project effect either because it is not presented or because it contains artifacts introduced by the current practices of test manufacturers. The aggregation of such evidence cannot, in turn, support inferences concerning the benefits that accrue to the aggregate of participants. However, other sources of evidence lead one to believe that in the aggregate economically disadvantaged children are probably still educationally disadvantaged. For example, recent results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (National Assessment Newsletter, 1972) indicate that economically disadvantaged children, as indexed by their parent's educational levels, race and geographic locale of residence, still fall below the national medians on reading skills. Corroboration of these findings for children attending minority-isolated schools (50% or more of enrollment is non-white) was found as a result of achievement testing in a nationally representative sample of such schools in Spring of 1973. Conducted to obtain baseline data for subsequent evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act, the findings were that the average child in grades 3, 4 and 5 performed at the 23rd, 18th and 19th percentiles respectively, on reading achievement;and similar results were obtained for mathematics achievement (Ozenne, D. G., et al., 1974).

---

* Some States have used the Anchor test results to equate achievement test scores for grades 4, 5 and 6 (1974). However, this practice is limited and will diminish as more manufacturers revise their tests.

** The direction of the bias is probably positive if one recognizes that children present at the beginning and end of the school year are more likely to be academically able than those who leave.

Until recently very little was known about the impact of either the Migrant or the Neglected and Institutionalized Delinquent Title I programs. Recently however, an evaluation study was initiated to remedy this latter deficit*, while the results of a Congressionally mandated study of the Migrant program have remedied the former deficit. A brief overview of the results of this study are given below.

Section 507 of the Education Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-318) directed the Commissioner of Education to conduct a study of the operation of ESEA Title I as it affects the education of migrant children. To meet the Congressional mandate, site visits were conducted at 162 project schools in 72 school districts in ten States (California, Texas, Florida, Colorado, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio and Washington) which received more than 70 percent of the migrant program funds in 1972; 131 principals, 301 teachers, 150 teacher aides, 87 members of advisory committees, 395 parents and 435 students were interviewed. In addition, ten noteworthy migrant education projects were identified and visited during the summer of 1973 for case study purposes. Analysis of the data indicated that migrant students and their parents reflect the values of the larger society in that they are supportive of the goals of the educational system, and parents share their children's aspirations for employment outside of the migrant stream in white collar and blue collar positions. Unfortunately, the mobility patterns of migrant students make the task of providing them with an effective educational program extremely difficult. Study findings indicated that migrant students tend to fall behind their non-migrant peers in grade level and in level of academic achievement in the earliest years of school and, thereafter, are never able to catch up. They are also less likely to enter or complete a secondary school program. Whereas the non-migrant child has a 95 percent chance of entering the ninth grade and an 80 percent chance of entering the 12th grade, the migrant child has only a 40 percent and an 11 percent chance of entering the ninth and 12th grades, respectively.

The data from the evaluation study would seem to indicate the need for the identification and/or design of effective elementary and secondary programs which meet the specific needs of the migrant child. A combination of economic support, effective remedial work and a clear sequence of activities leading toward specific instructional and career goals, especially for the child at the secondary level, is essential. For the younger migrant child, enrichment experiences at the preschool level and an emphasis on basic skills in the early elementary grades is needed if the achievement cycle of retarded educational growth and high drop-out rates is to be broken. Greater emphasis is also needed in the development and dissemination of effective programs which result in the acquisition of basic skills and reduce the isolation of the migrant child from his non-migrant peers.

---

* See the list of Ongoing and Planned projects.

Case study descriptions of ten noteworthy migrant education projects indicate that they employ a number of educational techniques and administrative practices which deserve further consideration. Site visitors observed that most of the projects were characterized by the strong central leadership of the project directors and the personal dedication of the staff. The use of token economies to augment student incentives for learning, a specially constructed bilingual curriculum, mobile units designed to develop entry level occupational skills, and a series of transportable tapes and lesson plans to provide continuity of educational experiences are just a few examples of the noteworthy aspects of the projects described.

The provision of educational services to migrants also depends upon the implementation of effective recruitment programs, as in the case of New Jersey, and greater interstate and intrastate coordination. The Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) has great potential as a storage and retrieval system for information on migrant children. It is likely that in the future teachers will be more systematic in their enrollment of students into the MSRTS, since it will be the basis for funding, but unless a periodic audit is conducted, student records are not likely to meet the criteria of accuracy and completeness necessary for their utilization as guides in the design and implementation of educational programs.

Ongoing (O) and Planned (P) Evaluation Studies

1. Analysis and Synthesis of Recent State Title I Evaluation Reports and Development of a Model Reporting System and Format (O)

The purpose of this study is to analyze the State Title I reports for evidence of effectiveness, to examine trends in these relationships over time, and to develop standarized reporting procedures and formats which will provide for valid, reliable and comparable data at the State and local levels. This study was initiated just prior to enactment of the Educational Amendments of 1974 (P.L. 93-380). The new legislation makes this project one of highest priority and suggests that its scope should be expanded. The next project will accomplish this.

2. Further Documentation of Title I Evaluation Reporting Models, Their Technical Assistance Requirements and Design of a Field Test (P)

The purpose of this study is to build upon the results from (1) by having each SEA and a sample of their LEA's indicate the problems they would encounter in implementing the model or models developed in (1), and the technical assistance they would require to carry out such implementation. On the basis of these results a strategy for the provisions of such services will be developed. The study also provides for the design of a field test of these new reporting procedures.

3. A Large Scale Evaluation of Compensatory Reading and Reading Related Efforts in the Elementary Grades (O)

This study, which dealt with the effects of regular and compensatory reading programs on students in selected grade levels over a single academic year, is coming to a close this year. It has yielded a wealth of descriptive information on the nature and conduct of regular and compensatory reading programs and has isolated a number of effective approaches and practices. These latter results suggest that different kinds of activities are effective at the lower than at the higher grade levels (e. g., 2nd versus 4th versus 6th). Such results point up the need for a study of the sustained effects of different program strategies on the same students over a number of years. The following study is intended to fulfull this need.

4. A Study of the Sustaining Effects of Compensatory Education on Basic Cognitive Skills (P)

The major purpose of this project is to isolate those sequences of educational experiences which are most effective in both reducing educational disadvantagement in the basic cognitive skill areas and in sustaining such reduction over a period of years. To obtain such information a three to five-year study of the same children and the programs they experienced over that time period is required.

5. An Evaluation of the Title I Neglected and Institutionalized Delinquent Program (O)

A study of the ways in which various aspects of this program might lend themselves to an effectiveness evaluation is currently in process. It is anticipated that various aspects of this study will be implemented during fiscal year (FY 75).

6. Design of an Impact Evaluation for the Migrant Education Program of Title I (P)

The most recent Education Amendments(P.L. 93-380) encourage the Commissioner to use the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) for the Migrant portion of the Title I allocation. The accuracy of the data currently in this system thus become an issue of increasing importance. In addition, a recently completed study of this program suggested that an impact evaluation utilizing pre and post measures might be feasible (e.g., according to their parents, 83% of the migrant children did not attend more than two schools during the academic year). To conduct an impact evaluation however, the MSRTS would provide one important vehicle for tracking migrant students, and therefore, the accuracy of its data is also of importance for these purposes. Hence, the proposed study would examine the feasibility and costs of conducting an impact evaluation and as part of this effort, the accuracy of the data in the MSRTS would also be examined.

Sources of Evaluation Data

1. Crosby, R. et al., *Presentation of National Estimates from the 1972 Consolidated Program Information Report (CPIR)* Bethesda, Maryland, RMC Research Corporation, September, 1974. (Study Under Auspices of National Center for Education Statistics)
2. National Center for Educational Statistics, Bulletin No. 19, DHEW/USOE, July 12, 1974.
3. National Center for Educational Statistics, *Digest of Educational Statistics*: 1973 Edition, Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.
4. National Center for Educational Statistics, *Education Directory 1972-73 Public School Systems*. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.
5. *National Center for Educational Statistics, Neglected or Delinquent Children Living in State Operated or Supported Institutions Fiscal Year 1971*. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.
6. Berke, J. and M. Kirst, *Federal Aid to Education: Who Benefits? Who Governs?* Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books - D.C. Heath, 1972.
7. Johns, R. L.; K. Alexander; D. H. Stollor, *Status and Impact of Educational Finance Programs*. Gainesville, Florida, National Educational Finance Project, Volume, 1971.
8. Wargo, M. J. et. al. *ESEA Title I: A Reanalysis and Synthesis of Evaluation Data from Fiscal Year 1965 through 1970*. American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, California, March 1972 (ERIC No. ED 059415).
9. The Planar Corporation. *Title I Reading and Mathematics Programs: A Compilation and Synthesis of Available Achievement, Expenditure and Model Project Information*. Washington, D.C., August 1973.
10. The Planar Corporation. *The Silken Purse: Legislative Recommendations for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act*. Washington, D.C., October 1973.
11. Tallmadge, G. R., et al., *State ESEA Title I Reports: Review and Analysis of Past Reports and Development of a Model Reporting System and Format -- Phase I Content and Trends Analysis*. Los Altos, California: RMC Research Corporation, November, 1974.
12. Farr, R., J. Tuinman and M. Rowls *Reading Achievement in the United States: Then and Now*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, August, 1974.

13. Rubin, D. et al. A Descriptive and Analytic Study of Compensatory Reading Programs: Phase I Report. Princeton, N. J. Educational Testing Service, August 1973.

14. Start, K. B., Thirty Years of Reading Standards in England. Educational Researcher, 1(11), November, 1972.

15. Trismen, D. A., et al., A Descriptive and Analytic Study of Compensatory Reading Programs: Final Report - Volume I. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, February, 1975.

16. Stallings, J. A., Follow Through Classroom Observation Evaluation. Menlo Park, California: Stanford Research Institute, August, 1974.

17. Dienemann, P. F., et al., An Evaluation of the Cost Effectiveness of Alternative Compensatory Reading Programs - Volume I: Cost Analysis: Bethesda, Maryland: RMC Research Corporation, September, 1974.

18. Dienemann, P. et al. Site Visit Reports for Summer Compensatory Reading Programs, Bethesda, Maryland. RMC Research Corporation, October, 1973.

19. Tallmadge, G. K. An Analysis of the Relationship Between Reading and Mathematics Achievement Gains and Per-Pupil Expenditures in California Title I Projects, Fiscal Year 1972. Palo Alto, California: American Institutes for Research, March 1973. (ERIC No. ED 071189).

20. Tallmadge, G. K., The Development of Project Information Packages for Effective Approaches in Compensatory Education. Los Altos, California: RMC Research Corporation, October, 1974.

21. Tallmadge, G. K., and D. P. Horst, A Procedural Guide for Validating Achievement Gains in Educational Projects. Los Altos, California: RMC Research Corporation, May, 1974.

22. Horst, D. P., et al., Measuring Achievement Gains in Educational Projects. Los Altos, California: RMC Research Corporation, October, 1974.

23. Foat, C. M., Selecting Exemplary Compensatory Education Projects for Dissemination Via Project Information Packages, Los Altos, California: RMC Research Corporation, August, 1974.

24. Piestrup, A. M., Design Considerations for Packaging Effective Approaches in Compensatory Education. Los Altos, California: RMC Research Corporation, June, 1974.

25. Anchor Test Study Equivalence and Norms Tables for Selected Reading Achievement Tests (Grades 4, 5, 6). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974 (Study under auspices of NCES)

26. National Assessment of Educational Progress Newsletter, Vol. V, No. 6, October, 1972. (Study under auspices of NCES)

27. Ozenne, D. G. *et al*., *Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) National Evaluation: Achievement Test Restandardization:* Santa Monica, California: System Development Corporation, 1974.

28. Exotech Systems, Inc. *Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title I Programs for Migrant Children of Migrant Agricultural Workers.* Vols. I - V. Falls Church, Virginia, January, 1974.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Supplementary Educational Centers and Services; Guidance, Counseling, and Testing

Legislation:

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, as amended

Expiration Date:

September 30, 1978

Funding History:

Year:	Authorization*	Appropriation
1966	$ 100,000,000	$ 75,000,000
1967	180,250,000	135,000,000
1968	515,000,000	187,876,000
1969	527,875,000	164,876,000
1970	566,500,000	116,393,000
1971	566,500,000	143,393,000
1972	592,250,000	146,393,000
1973	623,150,000	146,393,000
1974	623,150,000	146,393,000
1975	623,150,000	120,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Title III provides funds to support local educational projects designed to: (1) develop exemplary educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs and (2) assist the States in establishing and maintaining programs of guidance, counseling, and testing. Under Title III legislation, an innovative project is defined as one which offers a new approach to the geographical area and is designed to demonstrate a solution to a specific need, and an exemplary project is one which has proven to be successful, worthy of replication and one that can serve as a model for other school systems.

---

* An amount of 3 percent of funds appropriated is authorized for allotment to outlying areas, to schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and to overseas dependent schools operated by the Department of Defense.

The underlying rationale for Title III has been attributed to the Task Force on Education, appointed by the President in the summer of 1964. The Task Force believed that substantial educational change had failed to take place not because of scarcity of new ideas and programs, but because the effort to innovate and the mechanisms to disseminate innovative ideas had been on a scale far below the actual need. Title III, through its direct support for innovation, was intended to help meet that need.

Since FY 1971 the states have been responsible for administering 85 percent of the Title III funds by awarding grants to local school districts. Under this State plan portion of Title III, states qualify for funding by submitting an annual State Plan to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for approval. Funds are then allocated on the basis of a population formula. The only restrictions on the use of the State-administered funds are: (1) 15 percent must be used for projects for the handicapped, and (2) expenditures for guidance, counseling, and testing purposes must be equal to at least 50 percent of the amount expended by each State from funds appropriated for fiscal year 1970 for Title V-A of the National Defense Education Act.

The remaining 15 percent of Title III funds, under Section 306, administered by the Commissioner of Education. These discretionary funds also support local school projects, with awards based on the potential contribution to the solution of critical educational problems common to all or several States.

The Office of Education has attempted to foster more dissemination and replication of exemplary projects through: (1) the "Identification, Validation, Dissemination" strategy, (2) the development of a national diffusion network, and (3) the packaging of projects for installation and replication in other school districts. The "Identification, Validation, Dissemination" strategy (IVD) uses four criteria--innovativeness, effectiveness, exportability, and cost effectiveness--to determine the success of Title III projects. Validated projects become part of a pool of exemplary projects for dissemination to other school districts. The IVD stragegy has resulted in 191 validated projects: 107 in FY 1973 and 84 in FY 1974. Twenty-nine Title III projects, identified and validated by this process have been cleared by the Office of Education Dissemination Review Panel for nationwide dissemination.

Under Section 306 a national diffusion network became operational in FY 1974 with the award of approximately 87 grants. Thirty-three local school districts that had developed a successful program received funds to assist interested school distrcits in implementing the programs. Grants were also awarded to 54 additional districts to operate as facilitators - assisting districts in their states in the process of selecting a suitable program for adoption and acquiring assistance in implementing the program adopted. The overall purpose of the network is to assure the adoption of the most successful programs of the Office of Education by supporting efforts across State lines, in a short period of time, and at a fraction of the initial development cost.

FY 1974 Section 306 funds supported yet another replication effort through awarding grants to 17 school districts for the replication and installation of six "packaged" educational approaches. The approaches are packaged in such a way that all essential components and implementation guidelines are suffiently detailed to enable school districts to replicate the total educational approach. Fifty-three schools in eleven states began implementing the exemplary programs in the 1974-75 school year.

Program Scope:

In the State Plan portion (85%) of Title III 1703 demonstration projects that involved 7.3 million students directly and 12.4 million students indirectly were funded in FY 1972. In FY 1973, over 1,600 demonstration projects that involved 7.0 million students were funded. Information on FY 1974 is not yet available.

In the federal discretionary portion (15%) of Title III, 630 demonstration projects were funded in FY 1972. In FY 1973, 841 projects were funded, of which 451 were continuations and 390 were new projects. Most of the new projects funded in FY 1973 were concerned with reading readiness (355). The remainder focused on educational technology (24), projects for the handicapped (8) or national dissemination (3). In FY 1974, the emphasis of Section 306 grants (the discretionary portion of Title III) was placed on the dissemination and diffusion of successful educational programs and practices in areas of national concern. Of the 239 grants awarded in FY 1974, approximately 207 were awarded for this purpose; 32 were continuations.

Program Effectiveness

Because both the discretionary and State Plan portions of Title III fund diverse types of programs with a variety of goals, some cognitive and some not, it is not possible to assess overall program effectiveness in terms of students' achievement only. Studies which have been performed concentrate on assessing Title III's effectiveness as a demonstration program; that is, on whether projects are innovative; whether they continue after theusual three-year federal funding period, and whether they are disseminated to and replicated by other schools and districts. Although the data addressing these points is scanty, the evidence available suggests that the State plan portion of Title III has been moderately successful in these aspects. Because Title III discretionary funds have only been available since FY [illegible], it is too soon to ascertain the extent of continuation of the projects. The importance of the innovative aspect of Title III is a concern of most groups associated with this program. Concern has been expressed that the program may be emphasizing services rather than innovation, and the President's National Advisory Council (Annual Report, 1969) reported that the original emphasis on innovative and creative programs was losing ground. Kearns (1969) substantiated that point of view. In later reviews, the President's National Advisory Council (Annual Report, 1971, 1972, 1973) found the record more encouraging on the basis of selected projects, but they recommended changing the title to "Title III-Innovation in Education" to bring this major thrust to the fore.

Aspects of the continuation question have been explored in early years by Hearn (1969) and Polemeni (1969), however, the most recent and most thorough examination of this issue was done by Brightman (1971). He studied projects funded between 1966-1969, 1967-1970, and 1968-1971 and found that 64.4% of the projects in the first group was being continued at least in part, 67.0% of the projects in the second group, and 76.0% of the projects in the third group--the average figure for all three groups was 67.1%. Furthermore, he found that for all three-year projects which continued for some time after federal funding, 80.0% of the first group, 84.4% of the second group and 73.7% of the third group were in existence in the Fall of 1971. These data are summarized in the following table.

Time Interval	Percent of Projects Continued for Some Time After Federal Funding Ceased	Percent of Those Projects In Column 1 in Existence In the Fall of 1971
1966-1969	64.4%	80.0%
1967-1970	67.0%	80.4%
1968-1971	76.0%	73.7%
Average	67.1%	79.2%

Whether or not Title III projects have served as models which other schools or districts have adopted fully or in part has been a difficult question for researchers to answer because project people oftentimes do not know whether or not interested parties have in fact been able to replicate their Title III projects. Brightman (1971) found that when school superintendents were asked if their projects had been adopted in full by other school districts, 14.8% answered "YES", 53.0% answered "NO", and 32.2% were uncertain. When asked if the projects had been adopted in part by the other school districts, 45.4% answered "YES", 13.3% answered "NO", while a surprising 41.0% were uncertain. These figures represent superintendents' opinions, which are probably based in most cases on an expression of intent from other districts. No attempt was made in this study to verify that projects had, in fact, been adopted elsewhere in full or in part.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

1. A Study of Change Agent Programs

The Office of Education has contracted with the Rand Corporation to perform a two year evaluation of Title III (both the federal and state portion) along with three other OE demonstration programs. The first year of this study is nearing completion. Rand has analyzed survey data collected by a national sample of 289 projects in 18 states and has summarized the results of 30 case studies in 25 school districts. These data will be combined and synthesized with data collected on federal program management. The final report was completed in April 1975.

The second year of the study will collect data on projects whose federal funding has expired to assess the extent of continuation. The final report of the second year's work is expected in the winter of 1976.

2. Evaluation of the Field Test of Project Information Packages

The Office of Education has contracted with Stanford Research Institute to conduct an evaluation of the replication of packaged educational programs. The purpose of the study is to determine the viability of replicating exemplary education programs via an exportable package. Seventeen school districts that have received ESA Title III Section 306 funds to implement a packaged approach are participating in the study. The study is to take place over a two year period. The first year of the evaluation will focus on the installation and operation of the packaged educational approaches while the focus for the second year of the evaluation will be the impact of the projects on student achievement. Preliminary results are expected in the summer of 1975 while the final report of the field test evaluation is expected in the fall of 1976.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Catalyst for Change: A National Study of ESEA Title III (PACE): University of Kentucky, 1967.

2 PACE: Catalyst for Change, The Second National Study of PACE. University of Kentucky, 1968.

3. Hearn, Norman. Innovative Educational Programs: A Study of the Influence of Selected Variables Upon Their Continuation Following the Termination of Three Year Title III Grants. 1969.

4. Kearns, Doris. "The Growth and Development of Title III, ESEA, Education Technology, May, 1969, pp. 714.

5 Polemeni, Anthony J. A Study of Title III Projects, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 83-531 (89-10)), After the Approved Funding Periods. April, 1969.

6. Norman, Douglas and Balyeat, Ralph. "Whither ESEA III?" Phi Delta Kappan, November, 1973.

7. President's National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services. PACE· Transition of a Concept, First Annual Report. 1969.

8. ________. The Rocky Road Called Innovation. Second Annual Report, 1970.

9. ________. Educational Reform Through Innovation, Third Annual Report, 1971.

10. ________. Time for a Progress Report Fourth Annual Report, 1972.

11. ________. Annual Report, ESEA Title III, Fifth Annual Report, 1973.

12. ________. Annual Report, ESEA Title III, Fifth Annual Report, 1974.

13. ________. Innovation in Education, bimonthly reports

14. Consolidated Program Information Reports (Office of Education reporting form for program data). (Study under auspices of NCES)

15. Annual State Reports, ESEA Title III.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Strengthening State and Local Educational Agencies

Legislation:

ESEA Title V, amended
Section 104 of P.L. 93-380

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1978

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	25,000,000	17,000,000
	1967	30,000,000	22,000,000
	1968	65,000,000	29,750,000
	1969	80,000,000	29,750,000
	1970	90,000,000	29,750,000
	1971	110,000,000	29,750,000
	1972	140,000,000	33,000,000
	1973	150,000,000	38,000,000
	1974	150,000,000	39,425,000
	1975	150,000,000	39,425,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

1. Part A, authorizes the Commissioner to make grants to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the leadership resources of their education agencies and to assist these agencies in establishing and improving programs to identify and meet their educational needs.

Ninety-five percent of the Title V, Part A, appropriation is available to State educational agencies as basic grants. Of this amount, two percent is set aside for distribution to the outlying areas on the basis of need as determined by the Commissioner of Education. The remainder is distributed to the 50 States and the District of Columbia by a formula which divides 40 percent of the amount equally and 60 percent on the basis of the number of public school pupils in each State. The grants are made to each SEA on the basis of project applications. OE approval of these State Applications is required, following a determination that they conform to the broad purposes of Title V.

The remaining five percent of the appropriation is reserved for special project grants to State education agencies to enable groups of these agencies to develop their leadership capabilities through experimental projects and to solve common high priority problems.

OE strategy is based upon providing technical assistance to State educational agencies to strengthen their capabilities to bring about desirable changes and improvement in State educational systems.

2. Part B authorizes grants, beginning in FY 1970, to local education agencies to assist in strengthening their leadership resources and in establishing and improving programs to identify and meet the educational needs of their districts.

3. Part C authorizes grants, beginning in FY 1971, to State and local education agencies to assist them in improving their planning and evaluation capabilities. Of the funds appropriated for Part C, two percent is reserved for distribution to the outlying areas on the basis of need as determined by the Commissioner of Education. The remainder is allocated to the 50 States and the District of Columbia by a formula which divides 40 percent of the amount equally and 60 percent on the basis of the population of the State. Grants are made to State and local education agencies on the basis of applications. All local education agency applications are submitted through the State education agency for review and recommendations. Federal funds may not exceed 75 percent of the cost of activities covered in an application.

Title V, Part A, has provided formula grants to each State and outlying area since the Elementary and Secondary Education Act became effective. Part B has never been funded. Planning and evaluation activities authorized in Part C were initially funded under authority of Section 411, General Education Provisions Act, with flat grants to each State Education agency to assist in developing and strengthening their planning and evaluation units. Beginning in FY 1973, this activity was funded under authority of Title V, Part C, extending eligibility for grants to local education agencies.

Program Scope:

States are directing over forty percent of their Title V, Part A funds toward strengthening services provided for local education agencies, such as identification and dissemination of successful practices, planning and installing up-to-date curricula in the schools, and improving evaluation strategies and administration. Thirty-one percent of the funds support administrative costs of the State agencies, and nineteen percent support program planning, development and evaluation. The remaining funds support other activities of the State agencies, such as accreditation, licensing, and staff development.

In FY 1973 the State used their basic grant funds by object of expenditure in the following manner:

	% of total
Salaries	75
Contracted services	17
Equipment	1
Other*	7

---

* Includes staff travel; fixed charges (rent, insurance); supplies, materials, printing.

Special project grants under Part A supported 30 projects, which enabled State educational agencies to conduct studies and develop strategies and models for dealing with such problems as improving internal auditing; the State role and responsibilities in environmental education; the governance and structure of public education; State and local roles in accountability; and improved management of compensatory education. A major emphasis of these interstate projects is staff development. In 1973, 1,195 State educational agency personnel attended training workshops. In addition, two projects provided inservice training opportunities for chief State school officers and members of State boards of education.

States directed their Title V Part C funds in FY 1973 to maintaining and strengthening their planning and evaluation organizational units in the State educational agencies. In FY 1974 the States continued improving their planning and evaluation units. Ten States piloted models at local school districts, twenty-five States provided training in planning and evaluation for school personnel, and six metropolitan districts participated directly in establishing planning and evaluation units. Planning and evaluation grants were made to 92 local school districts.

The Title V program has enabled the State to provide additional manpower for leadership and services with major emphasis in the past year on (1) development and extension of comprehensive Planning and evaluation at both State and local levels; (2) establishment and extension of regional centers to provide local educational agencies with a greater variety of instructional equipment, materials, and services and with technical assistance for the improvement of management; and (3) introduction of new areas of leadership and service, such as statewide labor negotiations, school finance planning, and development of curriculums in new areas.

Program Effectiveness

The Title V objective to strengthen State Departments of Education poses substantial problems when it comes to measuring effectiveness of the program. The legislation suggests, but does not mandate, ways in which the States might use the funds to strengthen their education agencies.

A recent inhouse study (HEW, State Departments of Education) reviewed changes in State Departments of Education in recent years and, while finding wide variations in the quantity and quality of leadership services, reported emerging trends toward long-range planning, needs assessment, and establishment of priorities; improved coordination with related agencies at Federal, State, and local levels and with outside groups; development of new approaches to research and development; improved evaluation capabilities; and more emphasis on providing leadership and technical assistance to local education agencies. The study also reported significant change in the kinds and numbers of personnel in the State agencies.

Another study evaluated the program in terms of its impact on basic institutional change in the SEAs (Murphy, 1973). In-depth case studies in three States, and a less intensive review of developments in six others, formed the basis for the study. This study also found significant variations in the impact of Title V on strengthening SEAs from State to State, but the program helped fill gaps in services and management and enabled States to give more attention to some kinds of activities than they could have on their own. Expansion took place largely in traditional areas and did not stimulate SEAs into developing new roles and activities. The author concluded that this finding was more likely due to the way complex organizations behave with free money than to any particular administrative shortcomings at the Federal or State levels. While this study makes important contributions to the theory of the institutional change process in bureaucracies, the small number of State agencies studied and the primary focus upon "institutional reform" does somewhat limit one conclusion which can be drawn from the study about the impact of Title V.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. Murphy, Jerome T. Grease the Squeaky Wheel: A Report on the Implementation of Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Grants to Strengthen State Department of Education. Center for Educational Policy Research, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1973.
2. Advisory Council on State Departments of Education. Annual Reports, 1966-1970.
3. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education State Departments of Education and Federal Programs, 1972.
4. ____________________. State Departments of Education, State Boards of Education, and Chief State School Officers, 1973.
5. Annual State Reports, ESEA V.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Bilingual Education

Legislation: Expiration Date:

Bilingual Education Act Title VII, ESEA September 30, 1978

Funding History:	Year:	Authorization:	Appropriation
	FY 68	$ 15,000,000	$ 0
	FY 69	30,000,000	7,500,000
	FY 70	40,000,000	21,250,000
	FY 71	80,000,000	25,000,000
	FY 72	100,000,000	35,000,000
	FY 73	135,000,000	45,000,000 1/
	FY 74	135,000,000 2/	58,350,000 3/
	FY 75	135,000,000 4/	85,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Bilingual Education Program, as legislated in Public Law 90-247 of January 2, 1968, has been a discretionary grant program whose primary purpose is to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out "new and imaginative elementary and secondary school programs" designed to meet the special educational needs of children of limited English-speaking ability who come from low income families.

1/Of this amount, $9,870,000 was released and made available for FY 74.

2/Plus $6,750,000 authorized for the provisions of Section 721(b)(3) of P.L. 93-380.

3/Amount shown is after Congressionally authorized reductions.

4/Plus $7,250,000 authorized for the provisions of Section 721(b)(3) of P.L. 93-380.

Other authorized activities include research projects, the development and dissemination of special instructional materials, the acquisition of necessary teaching materials and the provision of pre-service training for funded classroom projects.

Public Law 93-380 of August 21, 1974, expands the program's purpose and scope, and the definition of those children who are expected to benefit from the program. The law declares that "The policy of the United States, in order to establish equal educational opportunity for all children," is to encourage the establishment and operation of bilingual educational programs at the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels to meet the educational needs of children of limited English-speaking ability, and to demonstrate effective ways of providing instruction for those children designed to enable them, while using their native language, to achieve competence in the English language. Grants for this purpose may be made to local educational agencies or to institutions of higher education applying jointly with one or more local educational agency.

A bilingual education project must provide instruction in and study of both English and, to the extent necessary to allow effective progress through the educational system, the native language of the children of limited English-speaking ability. Such instruction must be given with appreciation for the cultural heritage of those children. Again, to the extent necessary to allow the child to progress effectively through the educational system, instruction in elementary schools will be bilingual for all courses or subjects of study. Provision is also made for the voluntary enrollment, to a limited degree, on a regular basis, of children whose language is English, so that they may acquire an understanding of the cultural heritage of the children of limited English-speaking ability for whom the project is designed. The legislation makes clear, however, that priority for enrollment in a bilingual project must go to the children whose language is other than English, and that the project must not be designed to teach a foreign language to English-speaking children.

The focus of the Title VII program is on demonstration and developmental activities to produce model projects, trained teachers, and appropriate curricular materials which are needed to start additional bilingual projects. States and districts may then use the skills, strategies and materials developed with Title VII funds to install new bilingual projects supported with State, local, or other Federal funds (such as ESEA Title I).

The Commissioner is also authorized to make payments to the Secretary of the Interior for bilingual education projects which serve children on reservations, and which have elementary and secondary schools for Indian children operated or funded by the Department of the Interior.

The Title VII program is forward-funded; consequently, funds appropriated and obligated in a given fiscal year are used by grant and contract recipients in the succeeding school year. Fiscal Year 1975 funds will support a program strategy during the 1975-76 school year with a new emphasis on "capacity building," involving increased expenditures on teacher training and on materials development, acquisition and assessment. The impending shift in program strategy is described in the following section of this report.

Program Scope:

Fiscal Year 1974 funds available for obligation totaled $68,220,000, including $9,870,000 in Fiscal Year 1973 released funds, $50,350,000 in the initial Fiscal Year 1974 appropriation, and $8,000,000 in funds under a supplemental appropriation. Those funds are supporting 383 classroom demonstration projects, of which 200 are new starts for the 1974-75 school year. The demonstration projects involve an estimated 236,000 children, most of whom are in elementary school, at a total cost of $55,017,000, excluding in-service teacher-training costs. The projects involve 42 languages other than English, as follows: 23 Native American languages, 11 Asian and Pacific Islands languages, and 8 Indo-European languages. In addition, program funds are supporting in-service training for approximately 9,000 teachers and 3,645 teacher aides at a total cost of $6,817,000 and average cost per trainee of $547. An amount of $5,743,000 is being used for curriculum and materials development. Approximately $4 million of this amount is being expended at 6 sites specializing in materials development and acquisition. Further analysis of the 1974-75 projects shows approximately $48.[illegible] million spent on Spanish bilingual projects, approximately $5.5 million spent on the 23 Native American bilingual projects, approximately $1.5 million on French projects, $.5 million on Portuguese projects, $.5 million on Italian projects, $1.8 million on Asian projects, and approximately $9.9 million spent on "multi-lingual" projects involving two or more languages, one of which is usually Spanish.

Program Effectiveness:

It is appropriate to judge the effectiveness of the Title VII Bilingual Education program both in terms of its function as a demonstration program and in terms of the extent to which it is meeting the special educational needs of children who come to school speaking a language other than English.

As a demonstration, one mission of this program is to build resources and set up Federally-funded projects which can then be adopted with other funds both at the original site and elsewhere, thereby spreading the particular educational practice beyond the boundaries of the Federal program. Although formal attempts at dissemination at the Federal level are just getting underway, and although no projects have yet been officially designated as models for national replication, many Title VII projects are being visited informally by personnel from other schools interested in setting up a bilingual project and some of these are being replicated. A process evaluation supported with OE funds (Developmental Associates, Incorporated, 1973) showed that 31 out of 34 randomly chosen projects had received such visits and that 10 of these projects had been replicated, at least partially, by one or more schools. In general, therefore, it would appear that Title VII has succeeded as a demonstration in that, however informally, interest has been generated and models are being replicated.

In addition, by its very presence, the Title VII program has provided visibility to the educational problems of a particular group of children who previously had been virtually ignored. Since Fiscal Year 1969, the first year that bilingual projects were funded with Title VII monies, a growing interest in bilingual/bicultural education has developed. Because of heightened awareness of and interest in bilingual/bicultural education, the special needs of children whose dominant language is not English are increasingly being addressed by new legislation, programs, and support. For example, at least 14 States have passed legislation permitting or supporting bilingual/bicultural legislation and such legislation has been introduced in at least two other States. Prior to 1969, many States had laws expressly prohibiting the use of a language other than English as a medium of instruction. At least 9 States have earmarked money for some aspect of bilingual education, usually for teacher training or for actual classroom use. It is impossible to know to what extent the Federal program is directly responsible for these changes in the educational system; however, Title VII may well be a prominent factor in promoting these changes.

Besides being evaluated as a demonstration program, Title VII can also be evaluated on its effectiveness in producing positive changes in children in the cognitive, affective and behavioral areas. However, the only current source of data concerning the program's impact on children are the annual individual project evaluation reports whose limitations in the data or methodologies prevent them from being used to draw conclusions about overall program effectiveness.

The process evaluation implemented during Fiscal Year 1973 described in detail a sample of projects for Spanish-speaking children in the elementary grades. While it did not collect outcome data on children, the evaluation did provide some useful impressions of effectiveness.

The evaluators felt that the program had made an impressive start in its four years of operation and they found an extraordinary commitment and zeal among the staff. This process evaluation also highlighted some problem areas, the most severe being lack of trained bilingual teachers and lack of materials. Eighty percent of the project directors stated that there was a shortage of adequately trained teachers in their districts. It was also reported that persons in 62 percent of the projects felt that it was "somewhat" or "very difficult" to obtain materials, and furthermore that only one project was "totally satisfied" with the materials used. The projects in the sample were all serving Spanish-speaking children; the teacher and material situation is undoubtedly worse for most other language groups. The evaluators were cautious in intepreting the findings pertaining to materials. They pointed out that there is in reality an abundance of materials, especially in Spanish, developed both here and abroad. It appears that the problem is one of assessment of quality, and of dissemination, coupled with possible inappropriateness of materials.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation in OE has begun a major evaluation of the Title VII program. Contracted to American Institutes for Research of Palo Alto, California, the evaluation consists of three studies: an "Impact" study, directed at Spanish-language bilingual projects; an "Exploratory" study, directed at Native American, Pacific and Asian, and other European-language bilingual projects; and an "Exemplary" study, directed at identification of effective bilingual projects in the Title VII program or in other OE-supported programs.

The Impact study is in a planning phase during the 1974-75 school year, leading to field-data collection during the 1975-76 school year, and to data-analysis and reporting during the summer and fall of 1976. Data collection will be based on questionnaires, classroom observations, and pupil testing, in the fall of 1975 and spring of 1976, at 35 Title VII sites and at 10 non-Title VII sites which have OE-supported Spanish bilingual projects. It is planned to make the study longitudinal for the 1976-77 school year.

Analysis and reporting of data will be directed at such concerns or issues as: the impact of bilingual education on the achievement and attitudes of children whose home language is Spanish; the "process" characteristics of bilingual projects and the categories of projects which emerge from that analysis; the relationships that appear to result between process characteristics and project outcomes; the comparative costs and outcomes attributable to various project strategies in bilingual education; and the effect, if any, of racial and ethnic composition of classrooms on project outcomes.

The Final Report for the Impact study is due at OE on November 30, 1976. Its findings are expected to be the basis for reporting on the Title VII program in the Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the U.S. Office of Education for Fiscal Year 1976, and in the U.S. Commissioner's Report on the Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation to be submitted on November 1, 1977.

The Exploratory study is being implemented during the 1974-75 school year, with data analysis and reporting during the summer and fall of 1975. Data collection is based on questionnaires and observations during the winter and spring of 1975 at approximately 10 Title VII sites. Analysis and reporting of data will be directed at such concerns as: whether differences in ethnic or language groups of children have resulted in consistently different goals and strategies for bilingual education; whether there are consistent differences among ethnic or language groups in the availability of instructional personnel and materials; and whether there are consistent differences among such groups in the resources needed and costs incurred for bilingual education.

The Final Report for the Exploratory study is due at OE on September 30, 1975. Its findings will be included in the reporting on the Title VII program in the Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the U.S. Office of Education for Fiscal Year 1975.

The Exemplary study is also being implemented during the 1974-75 school year, with data analysis and reporting during the spring and summer of 1975. Data collection is based on evaluation reports and other project documentation, and on observations during the winter and spring of 1975 at approximately 10 Title VII or non-Title VII sites. Analysis and reporting of data will be directed at useful guidance to project planners, parent advisory groups, Boards of Education, teachers, and administrators, on what has been effective for children of limited English-speaking ability and can be replicated elsewhere with reasonable expectations of similar benefits. Reporting will also help meet the legislative mandate of P.L. 93-380 to the Commissioner of Education to establish, publish and distribute model programs in bilingual education.

The Final Report for the Exemplary Study is due at OE on July 31, 1975. Its findings will be included in the reporting on the Title VII program in the Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the U.S. Office of Education for Fiscal Year 1975, and in the U.S. Commissioner's Report on the Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation to be submitted on November 1, 1975.

Another current study by OE is an evaluation of four demonstration programs, including ESEA Title VII, which are meant to function as "change agents" in elementary and secondary education. Contracted to the RAND Corporation of Santa Monica, California, the evaluation is intended to describe the management strategies that the programs are using, to analyze the major choices of strategy in the management of demonstration programs, and, to the extent possible, to assess the effects of different choices of strategy. The Final Report is due at OE in February 1975 and its findings will be reported in the Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the U.S. Office of Education for Fiscal Year 1975 and in the U.S. Commissioner's Report on the Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation to be submitted on November 1, 1975.

P.L. 93-380 requires that the Commissioner of Education, in consultation with the National Advisory Council on Bilingual Education, submit to the Congress and the President by November 1, 1975, and again by November 1, 1977, a report on the condition of bilingual education in the Nation and the administration and operation of ESEA Title VII and of other programs for persons of limited English-speaking ability.

To help meet this mandate, the Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation will initiate a study during Fiscal Year 1975, which will focus on State-supported activities in bilingual education, the effect of Federally-funded activities upon State-developed and State-funded programs, and the consequent effect upon district projects serving children of limited English-speaking ability.

Source of Evaluation Da[illegible]

1. Development Associates, [illegible] A Process Evaluation of the Bilingual Education Program, Title VII, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Washington, D.C., December 1973.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Follow Through

Legislation:

Community Services Act of
1974 - P.L. 93-644 - Title VB

Expiration Date:

September 30, 1977

Funding History:	Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation
	1968		$15,000,000
	1969		32,000,000
	1970		70,300,000
	1971	$70,000,000	69,000,000
	1972	70,000,000	63,030,000
	1973	70,000,000	57,700,000
	1974	70,000,000	53,000,000
	1975	70,000,000	53,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Follow Through is an experimental program designed to test the effectiveness of 22 models in educating disadvantaged children in kindergarten through the third grade. The models reflect diverse educational concepts from highly structured positive reinforcement to free exploration and discovery in the open classroom. The models are implemented in school systems by sponsors, based primarily in universities and educational research laboratories, by means of grants from USOE to both sponsors and local school districts.

The Follow Through program is multi-dimensional, involving curricular approaches, use of para-professionals, individualization in learning, parent participation, and comprehensive health, psychological, and social work services.

1/ An authorization level was not specified prior to FY 71.

Program Scope:

Each year approximately 80,000 children (at least half from Head Start or similar pre-school programs) are enrolled in Follow Through classrooms in 169 project sites in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The national evaluation sample includes about half of the sites, representing ten sponsor models of widely varying educational theories. In addition to the national longitudinal evaluation, evidence of effectiveness is being collected on the remaining models and on some of the remaining sites and will be reported along with the national evaluation data.

Program Effectiveness:

The effectiveness of Follow Through as an experimental program will be determined by the degree to which it has fostered development of successful approaches to early childhood education of disadvantaged children. While it is too early to draw final conclusions, the evaluation evidence indicates differential effects from the various models. The magnitude of the effects, their stability over time and their consistency under different conditions are still being studied.

The national evaluation is designed primarily to determine which approaches are successful in producing educationally significant gains in areas such as cognitive achievement, motivation, self-esteem, and feelings of control over important events in one's life. The national evaluation is longitudinal and involves three successive classes, or cohorts, of children, with emphasis on Cohort III which entered the program in the fall of 1971. In general, children are tested as they enter school (either kindergarten or first grade), at some intermediate points, and when they leave the program at the end of the third grade.

The table below summarizes some of the results of the Follow Through evaluation to date. The effects of the ten models on reading, arithmetic and a variety of affective measures such as self-esteem and motivation, are illustrated. A + in the table means that Follow Through children outperform comparison children; a - means that comparison children outperform Follow Through children, and a 0 indicates no meaningful difference. As may be seen, there is substantial variation among models with respect to the various outcome measures. This would be expected from an experiment of this kind, although the large degree of variation

Summary Table of Selected Follow Through Effects*

	Models									
Cognitive Outcomes (Cohort III)	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Reading										
Kindergarten, Spring 1972	+	0	-	+	+	+	+	-	0	0
First Grade, Spring 1973	0	-	-	+	0	0	-	0	-	+
Arithmetic										
Kindergarten, Spring 1972	0	-	-	+	+	+	0	0	+	0
First Grade, Spring 1973	0	-	-	-	+	-	0	+	0	+
Affective Outcomes										
Kindergarten Tests, Spring 1972 (Cohort III)										
Academic Motivation	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	-
Feelings of Control over										
Positive Events	0	-	0	0	-	+	0	0	+	+
Negative Events	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	+	0
Classroom Obsevation Outcomes**										
Independence, First Grade 1973	+	0	+	-	-	-		-		
Third Grade 1972	+	0	-	0	-			+		
Task Persistence First	-	0	-	-	+	-		-		
Third	0	-	-	-	+			-		
Cooperation First	0	0	+	-	-	+		+		
Third	+	-	0	-	-			0		
Self Esteem First	+	+	-	+	-	-		-		
Third	0	+	0	+	0			-		

* Results are expressed in terms of difference between Follow Through schools and comparison schools. A result is defined to be educationally significant if it is equal to or greater than 0.25 standard deviation units.

0 = no significant difference between Follow Through schools and comparison schools
+ = significant difference favoring Follow Through schools
- = significant difference favoring comparison schools
blank = no data available

** Data on classroom observation reported by Stanford Research Institute; all other data reported by Abt Associates, Inc.; first grade data compiled from Cohort III, third grade data from Cohort I.

over time is perplexing. For example, the table shows 20 instances of measuring essentially the same cognitive outcomes at two points in time and in more than half of those cases the results change over time. One particular instance of a change may be seen in model G where reading goes from + at the end of kindergarten to - at the end of first grade. This means that at the end of kindergarten the children in Follow Through model G were outperforming children in comparison schools. During first grade both groups of children improved their reading skills but in such a way that by the end of first grade the comparison children were showing better gains than the children in model G. Overall, by the end of the first grade, Follow Through models surpassed non-Follow Through groups in five out of 20 comparisons in reading and arithmetic, while the non-Follow Through children excelled in seven instances. The other comparisons were not educationally significant. The table also shows affective outcomes at the end of the first and third grades but for two different groups of children. As with the cognitive outcomes, the affective results across grades are mixed; in half the cases, results differ for the two grades reported. The results must be regarded as preliminary at this time. Additional data and further analysis will be required before drawing conclusions about the effectiveness of Follow Through models.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Stanford Research Insitute is under contract to collect and process data for the national evaluation of Follow Through in the spring of 1975. The data is expected to be available in tape form for analysis in October 1975. Abt Associates, Inc. analyzed the kindergarten and first grade data. A contract will be let to analyze the second and third grade data. The Office of Education will synthesize data from sponsor and local project evaluation reports and will produce a final report, in 1977 following the completion of the third grade analysis.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Abt Associates, Inc. Education as Experimentation: Evaluation of the Follow Through Program Planned Variation Model Cambridge, Massachusetts, March 1, 1974
2. Abt Associates, Inc. Education as Experimentation: Evaluation of the Follow Through Program Planned Variation Model Cambridge, Massachusetts, January 15, 1975
3. Stanford Research Institute, Follow Through Classroom Observation Evaluation 1972-1973, Menlo Park, California, August, 1974

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (SAFA) - Maintenance and Operation

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
P.L. 81-874	June 30, 1978*

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	$ 359,450,000	$ 332,000,000
	1966	388,000,000	388,000,000
	1967	433,400,000	416,200,000
	1968	461,500,000	416,200,000
	1969	560,950,000	505,900,000
	1970	650,594,000	505,400,000
	1971	935,295,000	536,068,000
	1972	1,024,000,000	592,580,000
	1973	1,025,000,000**	645,495,000
	1974	989,391,000**	574,416,000
	1975	1,053,100,000***	636,016,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

P. L. 81-874 provides financial aid for maintenance and operation to school districts which have been affected by the activities of Federal installations in these areas. The purpose of the legislation is to minimize the fiscal inequities caused by both the presence of tax-exempt Federal lands and the burden of providing public school education to school children who reside on Federal property or whose parent is employed on Federal property. Payments are made directly to the LEAs and are based on expenditures from local sources per pupil, for children who reside on Federal property and/or reside with a parent employed on Federal property, or who had a parent on active duty in the uniformed services.

Also under this law, assistance may be provided to a school district located in a major disaster area as proclaimed by the President, (or a specific disaster determined by the Commissioner). Such assistance may be for: (1) repair or replacement of equipment, materials, and supplies; minor repairs to facilities and provision of temporary facilities; and for (2) assistance to support the level of education within the school district that was maintained prior to the disaster. School districts must apply for assistance.

---

*Provisions pertaining to A pupils and children attending schools on Federal installations are permanent.

**Includes disaster provisions.

*** Subject to change. Does not include disaster provisions.

Program Scope:

P. L. 874 is the closest approximation to general aid from the Federal Government available to eligible school districts. Funds received under P. L. 81-874 usually are deposited in the school district's general operating fund and expended in accordance with State law and practice. The number of school children counted for aid purposes in 1974 was 2,075,000, the total number of children attending schools in these eligible LEAs amounted to 24,000,000. Since the funds are deposited in the general operating account some or all of these children could conceivably benefit from the SAFA aid. In calculating basic law entitlements, school districts are reimbursed for the local cost of A pupils and for half of the local cost for B pupils.

Major Disaster Assistance Obligations and Expenditures to date are as follows:

Fiscal Year	Obligated	Expended
1966	$3,936,146	$3,936,146
1967	790,411	790,411
1968	3,300,296	3,300,296
1969	2,615,130	2,615,130
1970	5,172,071	5,170,682
1971	11,755,707	11,716,123
1972	41,036,604	36,523,743
1973	31,377,880	16,077,944
1974	9,719,200	7,860,135
Total	$109,703,445	$87,990,610

Program Effectiveness:

The SAFA program is not designed to produce measurable outcomes in school children. However, in the implementation of this legislation various anomalies have appeared. These have been amply documented in an extensive study conducted in 1969 by the Battelle Memorial Institute under the direction of the U.S. Office of Education. The study concludes that certain school districts are being over-compensated for the real or presumed burden of Federal activity as a result of one or more of the following situations:

1. Payments that far exceed the cost to the local government of educating Federal pupils.

2. Payments to wealthy school districts which could finance better-than-average school costs without SAFA aid.

3. Payments to districts where the economic activity occurring on non-taxable Federal lands (e.g., a leased oil well or an aircraft company on Federal property) generates enough local taxes to support increased school costs.

4. Payments to school districts which are compensated twice for the same government impact under different Federal legislation. For example, some districts benefit from shared revenues, such as timber and Taylor grazing revenues from public lands and are entitled to impact aid under P. L. 81-874. Because impact aid is based upon the student population rather than property characteristics, the two payments frequently overlap to the benefit of the school district.

5. Higher per pupil payments to rich districts than to poor ones resulting from the inclusion of local expenditure in calculating the aid formula.

6. Children are counted who would be attending school in a district even if the Federal Government had never come into the area. As an example, Battelle cites the case of farmers who take employment at an airbase and still maintain their farm residences in neighboring school districts which may now qualify for SAFA aid.

7. Payments that often do not reflect the economic stimulus that the Federal Government may cause in a community.

In a few instances, due to lack of funds, school districts are underpaid under the present law. For example, in one school district, government-owned house trailers were parked on private property near an airbase. In this instance, neither the airbase nor the trailers were subject to taxation and the school district was only able to impose property taxes on the relatively poor land on which the trailers were parked. In determining its entitlement, the school district was paid on the basis of B pupils because their residence was on private taxable property.

As a result of these observations, Battelle proposed specific changes in the legislative formula. Payments should be reduced to school districts for the so-called B students, (i.e., those students whose parents work on Federal property but live on private property) by modifications to the existing law:

(1) Absorption - Paying only for those students in a school district that exceed the Federal impact on all districts. This average impact for Federal activity was estimated at 3% of all students for the country as a whole. Under the present law, when the number of eligible students in any LEA exceed 3% of the average daily attendance by even one student, then all of the eligible are counted for impacted aid purposes.

(2) Change in rate of payment - Changing the payment rate for B pupils from the current level of 50% of the A students, i.e., those whose parents live and work on Federal property, to 40% of the A students. The rationale offered for this change is that school districts are presumed only to lose an estimated 40% of property tax revenues normally paid by business, which, for the parents of B students, is the untaxable Federal property where they work.

(3) Richness cutoffs - Reducing or eliminating districts that have an average tax base that is 25% above State average per pupil tax base. The present law has no such cut-off.

Battelle also suggested that the local tax effort be taken into account in devising any formula changes; that Federal in-lieu-of-tax payments, shared revenues and other special payments be deducted from impact aid payments; and that the capital cost program (P. L. 815) be merged with the operating cost program (P. L. 874).

P. L. 93-380 made substantial changes in this program, some effective in FY 75 and the rest in FY 76.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Battelle Memorial Institute, School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: A Study of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815, published by Committee on Education and Labor, H.R., 91st Congress, 2nd Session, G.P.O., 1970.

2. Administration of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, G.P.O., 1972.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (SAFA): Construction

Legislation:

P. L. 81-815

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1978*

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$50,078,000	$50,078,000
1967	58,000,000	52,937,000
1968	80,620,000	22,937,000
1969	79,162,000	14,745,000
1970	80,407,000	15,181,000
1971	83,000,000	15,000,000
1972	91,250,000	20,040,000
1973	72,000,000	15,910,000
1974	72,000,000	19,000,000
1975	72,000,000**	20,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

P.L. 81-815 is designed to provide local education agencies with financial aid for school construction under specified conditions. P.L. 81-815 authorizes financial assistance to eligible LEAs for construction of urgently needed minimum school facilities in school districts which have had substantial increases in school membership as a result of new or increased Federal activities (Section 5); where provision of the non-Federal share or construction impose a financial hardship (section 8); and for the construction of temporary school facilities where a Federal impact is expected to be temporary (Section 9). The law also allows the Commissioner to make arrangements for providing minimum school facilities for Federally-connected children if no tax revenues of the State or its political subdivisions may be spent for their education or if the Commissioner finds that no local education agency is able to provide a suitable free public education (Section 10). Assistance is authorized for construction of minimum school facilities in local education agencies serving children residing on Indian lands -- (Subsections 14(a) and (b). Under subsection 14(c) assistance also is authorized to financially distressed local education agencies which have substantial Federal lands and substantial numbers of unhoused pupils.

Emergency aid is available to LEAs for the reconstruction of school facilities destroyed or seriously damaged in school districts located in declared major disaster areas (Section 16).

---

*Provisions pertaining to section 5 (a)(1) pupils, sections 10 and 14 are permanent.

**Subject to change.

Since FY 1967, Federal funds appropriated for P.L. 81-815 have been substantially below the amounts required for funding of all qualified applicants under the Act. OE has utilized a system of priorities required by the law to determine the applications to be funded. Each section of the law has a priority ranking and within each section the priority of an application is based on the relative urgency of need.

All grants are made to qualified school districts on the basis of applications. The amount of payment to the LEA varies according to the section under which an applicant applies. Under Section 5, payment varies between 45% and 95% of actual per pupil construction costs depending on whether eligibility stemmed from "A" or "B" pupils.* Sections 9 and 10 provide for total payment of school construction costs for those pupils who are eligible to be counted for payment and who are also unhoused. Federal grants to provide needed minimum school facilities for children residing on Indian lands vary from 100 percent under subsection 14(b) to the difference between available State and local funds and the total project cost under subsection 14(a). Section 16 also requires that the Federal share be a residual payment after all other sources of aid have been utilized.

Program Scope:

Since 1966, the number of classrooms provided and pupils housed is as follows: (Note: These figures do not correspond to Fiscal Year appropriations.

Section and Fiscal Year	Classrooms Provided	Pupils Housed
Sections 5, 8, 9		
1974	223	6,223
1973	210	5,910
1972	0	0
1971	58	220
1970	7,901	201,770
1969	2,416	98,390
1968	903	27,218
1967	1,100	33,355
1966	1,630	47,405

---

*See School Assistance for Federally Affected Areas Maintenance and Operations, for an explanation of "A" and "B" pupils.

Section and Fiscal Year	Classrooms Provided	Pupils Housed
Section 14		
1974	135	2,981
1973	28	800
1972	5	100
1971	73	1,710
1970	11	332
1969	21	566
1968	21	690
1967	16	435
1966	87	2,600
Section 10		
1974	3	70
1973	0	0
1972	0	0
1971	161	4,151
1970	37	746
1969	137	3,704
1968	38	813
1967	100	2,440
1966	191	5,486
Section 16		
1974	53	1,025
1973	49	3,890
1972	146	3,890
1971	71	1,760
1970	40	1,155
1969	22	590
1968	21	590
1967	9	270
1966	0	0

Since FY 1966 when major disaster assistance was first authorized approximately $28 million has been obligated to reconstruct facilities destroyed or seriously damaged by hurricanes, tornadoes, earthquakes, and floods.

Program Effectiveness:

An evaluation of P.L. 81-815 was contained in the study by the Battelle Memorial Institute. The study concluded that with its system of project by project approval the administration of P.L. 815 is unnecessarily complicated. Furthermore, "because capital projects are easily deferrable in the Federal budget, P. L. 815 provides for uncertain levels of support based upon a priority system that tends to penalize a district that proceeds on its own to provide classrooms for Federally connected students."

Under P.L. 815, an eligible district which applies for Federal funds must show an increase in school membership over a 4-year period prior to receiving a project approval. In periods of partial funding (as in the present), the Act specifies which sections shall be funded first from any appropriation.

As presently worded, P. L. 81-815 makes no provision for the depreciation of schools built with Federal funds. The law is concerned with increases in Federally connected children. Should the number of Federally connected children become stable in the long run and should facilities initially provided under P.L. 81-815 become obsolete, then replacement costs would have to be borne solely by the school district.

In its study of SAFA, Battelle recommended that the capital cost program (P.L. 815) applicable to the usual situations be merged with the operating cost program (P.L. 874) in order to simplify its administration.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Battelle Memorial Institute, School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas: A Study of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815, published by the Committee on Education ald Labor, H.R. 91st Congress, 2nd Session, Session, GPO, 1970.

2. Administration of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1972.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Desegregation Assistance
- .Aug. 1970 - January 1973
  - .Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP)
- .June 1972 - June 1976
  - .Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA)

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
.Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP) P. L. 91-380	June 30, 1971
Continuing Resolution P.L. 92-334	January 31, 1973
--------	--------
.Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA)	
P. L. 92-318 (Title VII)	June 30, 1974
P. L. 93-380 (Title VI D)	June 30, 1976

Funding History	Fiscal Year Appropriation	
.ESAP	1971	$75,000,000
	1972	75,000,000
	1973	21,000,000
--------	--------	
.ESAA	1973	228,000,000
	1974	236,000,000
	1975	Pending

Program Purpose and Operation:

In May of 1970 the Administration proposed to Congress the enactment of an emergency school aid program designed to provide financial assistance to elementary and secondary school districts in the process of eliminating or preventing minority group isolation through desegregation. On August 18, 1970 the Congress appropriated 75 million dollars on the basis of existing legislative authorities for a short term emergency program designed to meet the needs of desegregating districts during the period of Congressional deliberations on the administration's proposal. The Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP) was thereby established. ESAP was later extended by continuing resolution through January 31, 1973.

During May - June 1972 Congress accepted the Conference Committee's report on the administration proposal and forwarded the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) to the President who enacted it into law on June 23, 1972. ESAA regulations were developed in late 1972, and by mid-1973 the first ESAA grants were awarded. The ESAA program became fully implemented in local school districts during the 1973-74 school year.

ESAP, the desegregation assistance program which served as an interim program between the introduction and passage of ESAA, was designed to provide financial assistance to elementary and secondary school districts to meet the special needs incident to their elimination of racial segregation and discrimination among students and faculty. There were five activities funded under ESAP; namely, community relations programs, pupil personnel services, curriculum revision and teacher preparation programs, student-to-student activities, and comprehensive planning. Local school districts, in applying for an ESAP grant, were required to develop local programs designed to meet the objectives of the ESAP on the basis of one or some combination of the authorized ESAP activities.

ESAP was phased out during FY 73 after the ESAA program was fully implemented. The primary objective of ESAA is to provide financial assistance to elementary and secondary school districts to: (1) meet the special needs incident to the elimination of minority group segregation and discrimination among students and faculty; (2) encourage the voluntary reduction, elimination, or prevention of minority group isolation; and (3) aid school children in overcoming the educational disadvantages of minority group isolation. ESAA authorized eight different categories of awards.

Seventy-four percent of ESAA's annual appropriation is reserved for two sub-programs, the Basic Grants (59%) and Pilot (15%) Programs. Basic Grants are awarded to eligible school districts to meet the special needs incident to the elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority group segregation and discrimination and to assist elementary and secondary school children in overcoming the educational disadvantages of minority group isolation. Grants may be awarded to any LEA which is implementing a desegregation plan or has adopted and will implement such a plan if assistance is made available. Project activities must be directly related to desegregation activities. Pilot Project Grants may be awarded for unusally promising projects designed to overcome the adverse effects of minority group isolation by improving the academic achievement of children in minority isolated schools. To be eligible an LEA must be implementing either a desegregation plan or a plan to reduce minority group isolation which would make it eligible for a Basic Grant. In addition at least 15,000 minority group students must be enrolled in the schools of the LEA or must constitute more than 50 percent of the total LEA enrollment.

The remainder of ESAA reservations, pursuant to statute and regulation, are for Nonprofit Organization awards (8%) designed to provide community assistance to desegregating school districts, Bilingual Education awards (4%), Education Television Projects (3-4%), Special Projects (including Metropolitan area Projects) (4-5%), and Evaluation awards (up to 1%).

Basic, Pilot, and Nonprofit Organization Grants are state apportionment Programs. Sums annually appropriated pursuant to the Act for Basic, Pilot and Nonprofit Grant categories are apportioned to States on the basis of the ratio of their number of minority group school-aged children to the number of such children in all States. Local school districts and non-profit organizations compete for the funds apportioned to their respective States. In applying for ESAA grants, local school districts must demonstrate that they have needs related to the Act's objectives and that they have designed a program based upon the Act's twelve authorized activities that shows promise in achieving one more of the Act's objectives. Nonprofit organizations must demonstrate in their applications that they have designed programs which will effectively support local school district efforts.

Applications for the discretionary grant programs (Metro, Bilingual, Ed. T.V., Special Projects, and Evaluation) are made directly to the Office of Education. Each of the discretionary programs has its own unique set of funding criteria and award procedures.

Program Scope

During the first award cycle for ESAP (Aug-Nov., 1970), 900 grants totaling 63.0 million dollars were awarded to local school districts and 7.2 million dollars were awarded to community groups for 144 Community Group Program Grants. The second ESAP funding cycle (Aug. - Nov., 1971) awarded 451 Local District Grants, and 142 Community Groups Grants totaling 63.9 million dollars and 6.9 million dollars, respectively. The third funding cycle provided grants only to school districts and community groups that received ESAP grants in 1971 ensuring them continued funding until ESAA funds were available to replace ESAP dollars. During the final funding cycle a total of 17.2 million dollars was awarded to 395 school districts and 96 community groups. The majority of ESAP grants over all funding cycles were awarded to southern or southwestern states where, at that time, the needs were the greatest.

The ESAA appropriation for FY 73 was 228 million dollars, 195 million of which was obligated to applicants that met funding criteria in terms of need and proposed program quality. During FY 74, 236 million dollars were appropriated and obligated to qualified applicants. FY 75 appropriation is pending, however under continuing resolution through December 1974, 2.3 million dollars were obligated to a total of four districts recently placed under court order to desegregate.

The FY 73 and 74 awards by program categories are summarized below:

Program	Obligation (X$1,000		Awards	
	FY 73	FY 74	FY 73	FY 74
*Basic Grants	117,675	155,261	455	570
*Pilot Grants	21,960	27,116	95	141
*Nonprofit Organization	29,081	19,896	241	238
Metro Grants	5,448	-0-	14	-0-
Biligual Grants	8,888	10,858	39	47
Ed. T. V. Awards	11,366	6,980	5	8
Special Projects	6,834	10,845	56	77
Evaluation Contracts	2,280	2,489	2	2
	$194,532	$233,355	907	1,083

*State Apportioned Programs

Program Effectiveness

The ESAP school district program was first evaluated during the 1970-71 school year.[1] On the basis of interviews of project directors, principals, teachers, and students in a random sample of 252 of 879 school districts receiving awards, it was concluded that school desegregation in the South during the period was not as turbulent as frequently thought. In general, most respondants reported positive changes in school racial climate and few respondants (1-3%) felt that the school situation had worsened during the school year. While not as sophisticated in design as later evaluations, the study did suggest that some ESAP activities such as counseling and special student programs were associated with positive change in school racial climate.

A larger scale and more sophisticated study of the impact of ESAP was conducted during the 1971-72 school year.[2] On the basic of questionnaires administrated to and interviews with school staff in a random sample of 600 schools, and the administration of achievement tests and questionnaires to students in participating and similar but not participating (control) schools, the following conclusions were drawn. First, ESAP funding was associated with statistically and educationally significant gains in the achievement of black male high school students--the very subgroup of students demonstrating the greatest need for such improvement. Second, those achievement gains seemed to be associated not with basic skill improvement programs but rather with improved race relations within ESAP schools. Third, human relations programs were effective in improving the attitudes of white urban students toward integration. Fourth, the study demonstrated that race relations within a school have more of an effect on student achievement than the actual racial mix within the school. Finally, the study concluded that desegregation places a great deal of strain on students regardless of their race, but schools can and do ease this strain by operating in a nondiscriminatory fashion and encouraging their staffs to support desegregation. The ESAP evaluation data from school year 1971-72 is currently being further analyzed in an attempt to determine why the ESAP program was so successful for black high school males and not so successful for other subgroups.

---

[1] Resource Management Corp., Bethesda, Md.

[2] National Opinion Research Center, Chicago, Ill.

The 1971-72 ESAP data plus other available data are being used to identify a group of successfully desegregated schools and a similar but less successful group of schools. On the basis of intensive study of those schools during the 1972-73, and 1974-75 school years, an attempt will be made to identify and document school programs, policies, and practices that contribute most to achieving and maintaining successfully desegregated schools.

The Community Groups subgroup of ESAP was evaluated during 1971-72.1/ On the basis of grantee staff and school personnel interviews in thirteen southern and southwestern states where most grants were awarded, the major problems attacked by community group grantees were identified and their success in resolving those problems was determined. In general, it was found that community groups focused their programs on what they perceived as their community's most pressing desegregation related problems, and they had their greatest success in meeting those problems as opposed to less pressing problems which they also addressed.
A national evaluation of the ESAA program began early in 1973, prior to full scale local implementation of the program. As designed by the Office of Education, the evaluation focuses on the two largest programs, the Pilot and Basic Programs. On the basis of student achievement tests and questionnaires administered to students and school district staff in a nationally representative sample of approximately 85 ESAA-funded school districts, 75 Basic and 42 Pilot elementary schools and 54 Basic secondary schools during school years 1973-74, 74-75 and perhaps 75-76, the evaluation will attempt to:

1/ Kirschner Associates, New York, N. Y.

- determine the short and long term national impact of the program in terms of the Act's objectives, namely, to meet the special needs incident to the elimination of minority group segregation and discrimination among students and faculty in elementary and secondary schools; to encourage the voluntary elimination, reduction, or prevention of minority group isolation in elementary and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority group students; and to aid school children in overcoming group isolation.

- identify and describe the needs of students in or from minority isolated schools, the characteristics of local programs including their resource allocation's relationship to needs, and the interrelationships of those factors with program impact.

- document and disseminate information relating to unusually successful local programs and program components.

- investigate the relationships among regular school expenditures, supplementary ESAA expenditures, and program impact in an attempt to determine local program cost/effectiveness and the minimum supplemental expenditures necessary to ensure some measure of program success.

The first year of data collection has recently been completed, however, data analyses will not be finished until June 1975. At that time and each June thereafter through 1977, a report will be forwarded to Congress which summarizes the findings of the evaluation to date.

As one of the first steps in the ESAA evaluation a standardized achievement test was administered to a random sample of students in a nationally representative sample of 100 minority isolated schools (i.e., schools with minority enrollment exceeding 50%) prior to full scale program implementation. The primary objective of the data collection in May-June 1972 was:

(1) to conduct a national needs assessment of children in minority isolated schools prior to program implementation, (2) to develop a more sensitive, valid, and reliable achievement test for the population of students to-be-assessed during the evaluation, (3) to create a set of supplemental achievement norms which in conjunction with existing national norms would permit comparison of the performance of a) students from minority isolated schools, b) children in similar schools throughout the country, and c) children in the nation's schools in general, and

(4) to develop a test less biased against minority children than existing achievement tests.

The national needs assessment indicated that children in grades 3,4, and 5 enrolled in minority isolated schools are achieving at approximately the 20th percentile in reading and math, i. e., 80% of the children in our nation's schools are achieving at a higher level. Further, the results suggest that the minority isolated school environment apparently depresses the performance of all children, regardless of racial or ethnic affiliation.

The May-June 1972 data collection activity was also successful in developing supplementary national norms for minority isolated schools and an achievement test less biased against minority children than any other existing test. The improved achievement test has and will continue to be administered throughout the ESAA evaluation.

Ongoing Evaluation Studies

1. Further Analysis of the ESAP-II Evaluation Data, under contract with the Rand Corporation. Due July 15, 1975.

2. Study of the Identification of Exemplary Desegregated Schools and Evaluation of the Determinants of Success, under contract with Educational Testing Service. Due Nov. 30, 1975.

3. Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act Basic LEA Program, under contract with System Development Corporation. Due June 1977.

4. A Longitudinal Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act Pilot Programs, under contract with System Development Corporation. Due June 1977.

Source of Evaluation Data

1. Robert L. Crain and others, *Southern Schools: An Evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of School Desegregation*. 2 volumes, Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1973

2. Eugene P. Seefeldt, *ESAP Community Group: An Evaluation*, Washington D. C.: Kirschner Associates, Inc. November 1972

3. *Evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program*, Bethesda, Maryland: Resource Management Corporation, 1971

4. *Need to Improve Policies and Procedures for Approving Grants under the Emergency School Assistance*, Washington, D. C.: General Accounting Office, 1971

5. *Weaknesses in School Districts' Implementation of the Emergency School Assistance Program*, Washington, D. C.: General Accounting Office, 1971

6. *The Emergency School Assistance Program: An Evaluation*, prepared by Washington Research Project and five other civil rights organizations, 1970

7. Ozenne, D. G., Van Gelder, Nancy, and Cohen, A. J., *Achievement Test Restandardization: Emergency School Aid Act National Evaluation*, Santa Monica: System Development Corporation 1974

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Training and Advisory Services (Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV)

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352), as amended by the Education Amendments of 1972, P.L. 92-318	indefinite

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	indefinite	$6,000,000
	1966		6,275,000
	1967		6,535,000
	1968		8,500,000
	1969		9,250,000
	1970		17,000,000
	1971		16,000,000
	1972		14,600,000
	1973		21,700,000
	1974		21,000,000
	1975		26,700,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Title IV is designed to provide training and technical assistance related to problems incident to school desegregation. Technical assistance is authorized in the preparation, adoption, and implementation of plans for public school desegregation. Training Institutes are authorized to improve the ability of teachers, supervisors, counselors, and other school personnel to deal effectively with special educational problems occasioned by desegregation. Local school district grants are authorized to give teachers and other school personnel inservice training and to employ specialists to advise in problems incident to desegregation.

There are four categories of assistance provided under Title IV to meet these goals and objectives: General Assistance Centers (usually maintained in colleges or universities), State Education Agencies. Training Institutes (operated by colleges and universities), and direct grants to school boards or school districts.

The $5 million increased appropriation above recent years represents a supplemental for awards to State Education Agencies and General Assistance Centers under an expanded definition of desegregation to include activities designed to alleviate situations such as that highlighted in the Lau v. Nichols decision, ie., situations involving non-English speaking students who as a result of language deficiencies do not effectively participate in the educational process. Also, the definition of desegregation now includes desegregation on the basis of sex as authorize by section 401 of the Civil Rights Act, as amended by section 906 (a) of the Education Amendments of 1972. Both of these changes are included in a recently published Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to amend the existing Title IV regulations.

Program Scope

In Fiscal Year 1974, Title IV funds and number of award were distributed approximately as follows:

	Percent of Funds	Number of awards
General assistance centers	46%	26
State education agencies	23%	39
Training institutes	21%	47
School district grants	10%	52
	100%	164

The percent of funds in each of these four categories was essentially the same as FY 73. total number of awards was somewhat higher in FY 74 than FY 73 (164 vs. 131), with the increase almost entirely in a doubling of the number of school district grants and more State Education Agency awards.* The trend in recent years towards directing more funds to the North and West continued in FY 74. The percentage of Title IV funds in the North and West** has increased from 31 percent in FY 69 to 57 percent in FY 73 and 64 percent in FY 74. This trend is the result of increased amounts of desegregation activity (primarily through court orders) in the North and West.

Program Effectiveness:

The effectiveness of Title IV must be based primarily on qualitative evidence which is subject to differing interpretations. The major criticisms of the program and steps taken to remedy them (mainly incorporated in program regulations which were adopted in late Fiscal Year 1973) are discussed below. Since there have been few formal evaluations of Title IV and none since those program regulations were adopted, an OPBE Title IV evaluation is now being conducted.

---

*Comparsions listing the number of FY 74 awards followed by the number of FY 73 awards are: GAC, 26 vs. 27; SEA, 39 vs 34; TI, 47 vs 44; LEA, 52 vs. 26.

**Defined as all current HEW regions except Regions IV and VI and the State of Virginia.

The most recent report -- which helped guide the development of the new Title IV regulations -- was released in January 1973 by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. The report critically reviewed the history of the program and recommended several changes in program administration. Among the major criticisms in the report were the observations that the school district projects were primarily directed and staffed by local school district personnel who seldom had influence over school district policies on desegregation, and that the State Title IV units and the university desegregation centers were predominantly staffed by white southerners whose previous education and experience were obtained in segregated southern school systems. One result was that the programs developed with Title IV assistance frequently had been geared to making minority students conform to white middle class values and standards of achievement. On the basis of this and evidence that Title IV grants to LEAs and university desegregation centers had been used to fund training programs in compensatory education without emphasis on the problems desegregation, the report recommended that the Office of Education adopt clear guidelines requiring that the primary emphasis of all projects must deal directly with problems of desegregation and that all Title IV recipients must be required to assure appropriate representation of all racial and ethnic groups, on an integrated basis, in staffing the project. The report also suggested giving priority to adequately funding those project applications that have the highest likelihood that Title IV assistance will be helpful rather than distributing the funds generally as an entitlement program.

Previous evaluations of Title IV had discussed the incongruous roles of the university desegregation centers in attempting both to provide needed technical assistance to desegregating school districts and to provide technical expertise to federal courts in desegregation litigation against school districts. In January 1972 the Office of Education forbade university desegregation centers from continuing to provide this assistance to courts except at the specific request of a school district. The Commission report criticized this change in policy, recommending that the Office of Education "require (Title IV) recipients to offer the full range of their knowledge and experience in helping to devise workable desegregation plans." In monitoring the performance of Title IV recipients, the Commission recommended that the Office of Education withhold further contract payments and use fund recovery mechanisms to force unwilling recipients to participate in the preparation of school desegregation plans and to testify in desegregation litigation.

The Office of Education has acknowledged a number of the criticisms of program administration that were made in the Commission report and earlier reports. In an effort to concentrate program funds on those projects which evidence the greatest potential for facilitating school desegregation, new grant application procedures for FY 73 required applications for State Title IV centers and general assistance centers to provide evidence of requests from school districts for technical assistance and/or training related to desegregation problems. Appropriate staffing in Title IV projects is now encouraged through application ratings which give more credit to proposals with staff experienced in desegregation assistance and representative in racial or ethnic composition of the population to be served. Also, the new guidelines require school district grantees to employ an experienced advisory specialist who will have direct and frequent access to the district superintendent. Although applications also will receive favorable ratings for having organized plans for self-evaluation, the Commission report's specific recommendation for independent evaluations of all Title IV projects has not been implemented.

The Office of Education responded to the Commission report's criticism of the policy of forbidding Title IV recipients from responding to court requests for assistance by stressing that the program legislation only allows technical assistance to be provided upon the request of a school district and that previous assistance to courts had been provided in the absence of clarification of the legislation. It also said that public and private institutions of higher education must receive equal and fair consideration in funding decisions and that contractual obligations of Title IV recipients have been enforced, resulting in termination of two State Education Agency contracts in FY 72.

Ongoing and Planning Evaluation Studies:

The current evaluation being conducted under contract to OE will address the major issues raised in the Commission's report. This evaluation will assess the effectiveness of Title IV program regulations and guidelines, describe the activities and services provided by Title IV projects, and assess the utility of Title IV training and technical assistance as viewed by the school district personnel receiving assistance from Title IV projects.

The evaluation is being conducted under contract to the Rand Corporation.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. DHEW, *Equal Education Opportunities*, Washington, D. C., 1970 (OE-38017).

2. U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Title IV and School Desegregation: A Study of a Neglected Federal Program*, Washington, D. C,: U. S. Government Printing Office, January 1973.

3. Race Relations Information Center, Title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act: A program in Search of a Policy, Nashville, Tenn. ,1970.

4. Washington Research Project, University Title IV Centers, 1971 (Unpublished).

5. DHEW, Review of the Set of Finding Developed by the Education Coalition Concerning the Programs and Operations of the University Title IV Centers, (Unpublished), 1971.

B. EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED PROGRAMS

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

State Grant Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part B Assistance to States for Education of Handicapped Children; as amended by P.L. 93-380, Sections 612, 613 614, 615	June 30, 1977

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1967	$51,500,000	$ 2,475,000
	1968	154,500,000	15,000,000
	1969	167,375,000	29,250,000
	1970	206,000,000	29,190,000
	1971	206,000,000	34,000,000
	1972	216,300,000	37,499,000
	1973	226,600,000	50,000,000
	1974		47,500,000
	1975	1/	97,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Non-matching grants to the States are made to assist in the initiation, expansion, and improvement of education of handicapped children at the pre-school, elementary, and secondary levels. Funds are allocated to the States in proportion to the States' populations in the age range of 3 to 21 (minimum allocation of $200,000). Up to 5% or $100,000 of the State grant may be used for administration of educational programs for the handicapped by State Education Agencies.

Seven million children (one million of pre-school age) are estimated to be handicapped by mental retardation, speech problems, emotional disorders, deafness, blindness, crippling conditions or other health impairments that can be expected to cause school failure, emotional problems and retarded development unless special educational procedures are available to them. At present, it is estimated that only 50% of school age children are receiving special education, and in some States only 10-15% of the children are receiving this help. Approximately one million of these unserved children are totally excluded from any educational programming.

1/ Full funding of the entitlement for FY 75 would be $666,600,550.

The Federal strategy for the development of the program has been to serve as a catalyst to local and State program growth rather than providing full Federal support for a limited number of children. Joint planning with the States has led to increased programming for children on a comprehensive basis involving various Federal programs and local resources, e.g., the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Titles I and III, Vocational Education Act, etc.

Program Scope:

In 1974, about 225,000 children participated directly in Federally supported projects under this Title VI-B program.

Program monitoring information indicates that the program helped to stimulate educational opportunities, supported by non-Federal funds, for an additional 250,000 handicapped children in 1974 by providing developmental and technical assistance to States; States were assisted in designing new programs, coordinating Federal and State funding, and developing strategies for increasing services to handicapped children. A number of States modified their statutes to allow for services to children following models of Federal programming.

Program Effectiveness:

A formal evaluation of the State-grant program indicated that EHA-B has contributed to the expansion of State services, programs and mandates for serving handicapped children. The most effective component appeared to be the administrative set-aside of EHA-B which increased capability for planning programs at the SEA level. Less effective was the project component of EHA-B; although project grants permitted local districts to develop innovative programs which would not otherwise occur, the impact of that innovation was largely restricted to the particular district which received the grant. There was not a significant replication impact in other districts which did not receive EHA-B funds.

The study hypothesized that the failure of EHA-B to produce a multiplier effect could be traced to the nature of fiscal support provided by the EHA legislation. The certainty of receiving a continuing and "non-matching" federal grant lessens the probability that local districts will undertake such projects on their own. Consequently, EHA has little effect on changing local priorities in the allocation of non-federal resources.

A second problem identified is that the EHA-B per capita formula does not take into account the marked differences among States and local governments in their ability to pay for programs for handicapped children. Thus, the formula does not correct the existing situation whereby a child's chance of receiving appropriate services depends largely on where his family lives.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Source of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Evaluation of an Aid-to-States Program for Education of Handicapped Children, by Exotech Systems, Inc.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Aid to States for Education of Handicapped Children in State-Operated and State-supported Schools

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
ESEA Title I, Section 121 (P.L. 89-313): as amended by P.L. 93-380, Section 101 (a) (2) (E)	June 30, 1977

Funding History	Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation
	1966		$ 15,900,000
	1967		15,100,000
	1968		24,700,000
	1969		29,700,000
	1970		37,500,000
	1971		46,100,000
	1972		56,400,000
	1973		75,962,098
	1974		85,777,779
	1975		88,085,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The program provides federal assistance to State agencies which are directly responsible for providing free public education for handicapped children.

Institutions which qualify for participation range from those which provide full-year residential programs to those which provide special itinerant services on a part-day basis for handicapped children enrolled in regular day schools or who may be confined to their homes because of severe handicapping conditions. In each instance, a substantial part of the educational costs are borne by a State agency (SA) rather than a local agency. Participating institutions serve one or more categories of handicapped children, including mentally retarded, hard-of-hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually impaired, seriously emotionally disturbed, and crippled or other health impaired children.

Federal funds under this program are determined by a formula which specifies that, of each handicapped child in average daily attendance (ADA) in an

---

1/ The Authorization level under this legislation is determined by formula and taken from the total Title I appropriation prior to any other allocation of Title I funds. See text for definition of the formula.

elementary or secondary educational program operated or supported by a State agency, the SA receives an amount equal to half the State expenditure for a child enrolled in its public schools, or half of the national average, whichever is higher.

At the Federal level, organizational responsibility for this program is vested in the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH). Allocations under the program, as determined by BEH, are issued to State agencies. Applications for the project funds are then submitted by participating institutions to their supervising State agency. The SA reviews the applications, and forwards those which it approves to the State educational agency (SEA) for final approval and the release of funds. The participating institution is required to submit end-of-project reports to its SA to account for the expenditure of funds and to provide an evaluation of project activities.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In FY 1974, approximately $86 million were allocated to 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and Guam. Allocations to States ranged from a low of $130,128 for Nevada, based on its reported average daily attendance of handicapped children, to $9,996,871 for New York.

The funds allocated were administered by 150 State agencies which supervised project participation at about 3,250 schools for handicapped children. The average daily attendance reported by these institutions was 166,415 children for the school year 1972, the attendance year data used in establishing the FY 1974 allocations. Those children benefiting under the program are distributed across the following handicap categories approximately as follows: Mentally Retarded-62%; Deaf and Hard of Hearing-13%; Emotionally Disturbed-13%; Crippled and Other Health Impaired-7%; Visually Handicapped-5%.

Data on the impact of P.L. 89-313 funds will be provided by the evaluation study described below.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An impact evaluation of this program is currently underway in a sample of 25 States and approximately 900 institutions. The objectives of this study are (a) to assess the impact of the program and (b) to determine if the impact can be increased.

An intermediate undistributed report of the evaluation study provides a summary of existing data on the target population and beneficiaries of P.L. 89-313. Statistical data are presented generally for the years 1966-73, and were gathered from a variety of published and unpublished records. The report indicates quantitative change in the program, including shifts in the relative allocations for various handicapping conditions, trends in ADA rates by State and region, and changes in enrollment figures by types of program since 1966.

In addition, the report discusses problems of inconsistent prevalence estimates, and of the present grant formula which perpetuates the extreme variability among States in the volume of services provided. Calculations of the effect of a revenue sharing formula on P.L. 89-313 allocations are provided, by State. Actual impact on schools will be measured in Phase II.

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
2. Evaluation of Education Programs in State-operated and State-supported Schools for Handicapped Children by Exotech Systems, Inc. (estimated completion date: Spring, 1975

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Regional Resource Centers

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part C-
Centers and Services to Meet Special
Needs of the Handicapped, Sec. 621;

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1977

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968	$ 7,750,000	
	1969	7,750,000	$ 5,500,000
	1970	10,000,000	1,800,000
	1971*		3,550,000
	1972*		3,550,000
	1973*		6,226,000
	1974		7,243,000
	1975	12,500,000	9,243,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides grants and contracts to institutions of higher education, State educational agencies, or nonprofit private organizations, to establish and operate regional centers. The purpose of these centers is to increase the development and application of diagnostic and educational programs for handicapped children. The Centers use demonstrations, dissemination, training, financial assistance, staff expertise, and direct services as strategies for carrying out their assistance role. Among major activities of the Centers are:

1. Identification of unserved handicapped children;
2. Measurement and diagnosis of handicapped children for the purpose of proper educational placement;
3. Development of educational and vocational programs for handicapped children;

---

* Totals of $36,500,000 in 1971, $51,500,000 in 1972, and $66,500,000 in 1973, are authorized for Part C, EHA, which includes early childhood projects, regional resource centers, and deaf-blind centers.

4. Provision of technical assistance to relevant personnel, including teachers and parents, in implementing appropriate services for the handicapped learner;

5. Periodic re-examination, re-prescription or case-tracking to validate appropriateness of program placement for children.

In 1974, the RRC program provided special target grants to assist States, local agencies and consortiums in assessing and meeting urgent needs concerning the severely handicapped (e.g. those resulting from recent court mandates to serve all handicapped children within a State).

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

During FY 1974, approximately 42,000 handicapped children received comprehensive services (diagnostic, prescriptive, remedial or other supportive services) which were coordinated through six regional centers. Plans were finalized for extending the program nationally by funding seven additional regional centers. Training was provided to 6200 State & LEA personnel.

Bureau review and analysis of the RRC's indicated that there needed to be stronger coordination among RRC's and the Instructional Materials Centers. There were gaps or duplications in service in some regions covered by both RRC and IMC systems. Therefore, in FY 74, both types of centers were funded through competitive contract awards, and the resulting "Learning Resource Center" system will eliminate the less fruitful strategies or models for service in both areas.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of this program will be implemented in Spring, 1975.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Deaf-Blind Centers

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part C- Centers and Services to Meet Special Needs of Sec. 622	June 30, 1977

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1968	$ 3,000,000	
	1969	3,000,000	$ 1,000,000
	1970	7,000,000	2,000,000
	1971*		4,500,000
	1972*		7,500,000
	1973*		15,795,000
	1974*		14,055,000
	1975	15,000,000	12,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides grants or contracts to public and nonprofit private organizations to establish and operate centers for educational and diagnositc services for deaf-blind children. The centers also initiate whatever ancillary services are necessary to assure that these children can achieve their full potential, and meaningful participation in society.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In 1974, the Deaf-Blind program, through its 10 regional centers, developed more than 250 programs and projects with the support of Federal funds. These programs and projects have coordinated the following resources and services for deaf-blind children and their families: educational services for 2800 children (residential and day school); part-time educational services for 300 children; diagnostic and educational assessment for 700 children; parent counseling services for 3,000 parents, and inservice training for 3,000 educators, professionals, and parents. The program is aimed at an estimated target population of 5000 - 7000 deaf-blind children.

---

* Totals of $36,500,000 in 1971, $51,500,000 in 1972, and $66,500,000 in 1973, are authorized for Part C, EHA, which includes early childhood projects, regional resource centers, and deaf-blind centers.

Program monitoring information indicates that the Centers have been successful in terms of reaching increasing numbers of deaf-blind children. Currently the program serves 3461 children of the estimated total target population of 5,000 - 7,000 children, coordinating appropriate services among 123 local and State agencies. This represents rapid growth from the 1969-70 school year, when coordination existed among only 6 agencies, and 100 children were served.

Despite this evidence of growth, considerable regional variation exists in amount and quality of service provided. The Bureau is currently reviewing the centers in preparation for establishing basic minimum standards of service for the entire program.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A formal assessment of the resources available for severely handicapped children is directly related to this program. The study will evaluate the adequacy of services for a national sample of 100 programs and institutions which provide services to deaf-blind, severely mentally retarded, severely emotionally disturbed, and multiply handicapped children and youth. The study will be completed in March, 1975.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Assessment of Available Resources for Services to Severely Handicapped Children, Abt Associates, Inc. (estimated completion date: March, 1975)

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Early Childhood Education

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part C-
Centers and Services to Meet Special
Needs of the Handicapped. Sec. 623;

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1977

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1969	$ 1,000,000	$ 945,000
	1970	10,000,000	3,000,000
	1971*		7,000,000
	1972*		7,500,000
	1973*		17,739,000
	1974		12,000,000
	1975	25,500,000	14,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides grants and contracts on a matching basis (90% Federal: 10% Local) to stimulate the development of comprehensive educational services for young (0-8 years) handicapped children with a primary focus on the pre-school age level (0-5) years. The objective is to encourage growth of early childhood services for all pre-school aged handicapped children in Federal, State, and local educational and day care programs to prevent and reduce the debilitating effects of a handicap upon the children. Between 50% and 75% of these children fall into the categories of mild retardation, emotional disturbance, and of children who, with early childhood programming, would have an excellent chance of overcoming their handicaps by developing compensatory skills so that they can attend regular classes.

"The funded projects are two-phased: demonstration (planning phase and operational phase) andreach..." The Federal strategy through outreach is to gain replication of successful demonstrations at the local and state level.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In FY 1974, the program supported 104 demonstration and 51 outreach projects, which provided direct services to approximately 7,000 children. Through replications of model projects and outreach activities, an additional 10,000 children were served. Training and other supportive services were provided to 14,000 parents, 3,000 Head Start staff members, 5,000 public school educators, and 7,500 day care and nursery school staff and volunteers. In addition, diagnostic/screening services were provided to 15,000 handicapped children.

---

* Totals of $36,500,000 in 1971, $51,500,000 in 1972, and $66,500,000 in 1973, are authorized for Part C, EHA, which includes early childhood projects, regional resource centers, and deaf-blind centers.

This program has also supported workshops and other technical assistance activities through its Technical Assistance Development System (TADS), and funds segments of the Mister Roger's Neighborhood television program which discusses acceptance of handicapping conditions among preschoolers.

Program monitoring information, based on FY 73 reports sent to BEH by the projects themselves, indicate the following measures of effectiveness:

> 657 children graduated to other programs which previously would not accept them;
>
> 513 children were placed in special education classes;
>
> 886 children progressed sufficiently to be approved for enrollment in regular kindergarten or day care programs;
>
> 214 projects replicated complete models of early childhood programs;
>
> 280 projects replicated components of model programs.

The implications of these data are that the program has been effective in increasing services provided to young handicapped children.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A formal evaluation study began in September, 1973, and will be completed in the fall of 1975. It will assess children's performance, project services and costs for a sample of third and fourth year projects.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

Evaluation of the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program, Battelle Memorial Institute. (estimated completion date: Fall, 1975)

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Special Education Manpower Development

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part D-Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped, Sec. 631-2 and Sec. 634;

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1977

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	$ 14,500,000	$ 14,500,000
	1966	19,500,000	19,500,000
	1967	29,500,000	24,500,000
	1968	34,000,000	24,500,000
	1969	37,500,000	29,700,000
	1970	55,000,000	29,700,000
	1971*		31,900,000
	1972*		34,406,000
	1973*		41,351,000
	1974		39,615,000
	1975	45,000,000	37,700,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides grants to institutions of higher education, State education agencies, and other non-profit agencies to prepare teachers, supervisors, teacher educators, researchers, speech correctionists and other special service personnel to educate the handicapped. Extention of quality educational service to all handicapped children under current teacher-student ratios and current patterns of instructional organization will require an additional 245,000 teachers for school age children and 60,000 for preschool children. Upgrading and updating the skills of the 240,000 special education teachers currently employed, of whom nearly one-half are uncertified, is also necessary.

This program attacks the problem by using Federal grants to increase the number of teachers trained, by development of new models for improved effectiveness, and by targeting resources on crucial areas of need.

---

* A total of $69,500,000 in 1971, $87,000,000 in 1972, and $103,500,000 in 1973, is authorized for Parts D, EHA.

In FY 1972, the program began awarding general "block" grants to institutions rather than grants based on a fixed number of student stipends, as in preceding years. This gave grantees more flexibility in their allocation of funds, by enabling them to increase support of faculty salaries and curriculum development in addition to traditional student financial assistance. This strategy was intended to have a multiplier effect, by upgrading personnel preparation programs with a limited investment of federal funds.

Program Scope:

During FY 74, approximately 21,000 students received financial support from this program as a result of "block" grant support received by university departments.

A total of 559 grants were awarded: 410 academic year training grants, 54 special project grants for development and demonstration of new teaching models and techniques, 56 continuing education projects, 27 grants for regular education, and 12 for paraprofessional development.

At the presently low level of service (50% of handicapped children served), special education teacher production is just keeping up with the demand created by attrition in the field and the need to fill open slots. That is, the demand annually for approximately 20,000 new teachers is roughly the same as the number of special education graduates produced each year. However, as efforts increase on the part of States to raise the extent or quality of services to the handicapped, this program may not be able to fill the demand for new personnel.

Program Effectiveness:

A formal evaluation of the Manpower Development program was conducted during 1971-72. The data suggested that Title VI-D support was an important factor in attracting and/or retaining about one-third of the student grantees in special education. For the remaining grantees, the financial support tended to facilitate a commitment which had already been made, i.e., it enabled them to receive their degrees sooner, or to obtain certification in a specialty area. There was no significant difference in the retention rates of special education teachers who had received VI-D grants as students and those who had received other forms of support, i.e., other Federal, State or university grants, stipends, etc.

The data also indicated that recipients of Title VI-D grants were not distributed among specialty areas in proportion to need estimates. Students tended to be overrepresented in the field of sensory disorders and underrepresented in the field of learning disorders. Students were also unevenly distributed with regard to race and sex: they tended to be predominantly white (96%) and female (78%), with males clustering at the higher levels of graduate study.

The evaluation study recommended a heavier investment in SEA programs to retain regular classroom teachers and those special education teachers needing certification. Strategies for improving the distribution of students along dimensions of race, sex and specialty area were also recommended.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Source of Evaluation Data:

An Evaluation of Federal Programs to Increase the Pool of Special Education Teachers; RMC Research Corporation (1973).

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Recruitment and Information

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part D- Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped, Sec. 633;	June 30, 1977

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968	$ 1,000,000	
	1969	1,000,000	$ 250,000
	1970	1,000,000	475,000
	1971*		500,000
	1972*		500,000
	1973*		664,000
	1974		500,000
	1975	500,000	500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides for non-matching grants or contracts to maintain appropriate information and referral services for parents and their handicapped children, in order that they may be assisted in their attempts to obtain diagnostic and educational services. In addition, the program supports projects to interest people in the career field of special education.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In FY 1974, a referral system was maintained in approximately 100 cities. The referral centers, operating through Health and Welfare Councils, are designed to assist parents and other persons in obtaining services and placements for handicapped children. Regional television and radio campaigns were undertaken in concert with other HEW activities concerning the handicapped in an effort to coordinate information systems across States.

In addition, the Special Education Information Center (SEIC) maintained a computerized national directory of existing special education programs and facilities, and disseminated related information through its newsletters to approximately 100,000 parents and educators.

---

* A total of $69,500,000 in 1971, $87,000,000 in 1972, and $103,500,000 in 1973, is authorized for Part D, EHA.

The Special Education Information Center solicits and receives substantial feedback from parents who have received referral services or information through newsletters. On the basis of this information, the service provided by SEIC appears to be successfully meeting a very great need for information on where and how to obtain programs for handicapped children.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Innovation and Development

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part E-
Research in the Education of the
Handicapped, Sec. 641 & Sec. 642;

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1977

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	$ 2,000,000	$ 2,000,000
	1966	6,000,000	8,000,000
	1967	9,000,000	8,100,000
	1968	12,000,000	11,100,000
	1969	14,000,000	12,800,000
	1970	18,000,000	12,060,000
	1971	27,000,000	15,000,000
	1972	35,500,000	11,176,000
	1973	45,000,000	9,916,000
	1974		9,916,000
	1975	15,000,000	9,916,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program addresses the improvement of educational opportunities for handicapped children through support of decision-oriented knowledge production and utilization. This support includes contracts for research, development, diffusion and adoption activities. Activities are integrated in a planned pattern to support teacher training and the special service functions of the total Federal program for handicapped children. The innovation and development activity attempts to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the educational system and its provisions for handicapped children: by supporting the development and validation of new service models, by packaging that information in usable form, and by systematically assuring that this information is placed in appropriate hands.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

During FY 1974, 100 projects were supported; of these, 50 were continuations of projects begun in previous years, and 50 were new efforts. Approximately 53% of the total funds available were used to support research activities, and the remaining 47% used to support demonstrations and development efforts.

Examples of the types of activities supported during FY 74 follow:

(1) Improved services to preschool children;
(2) Increased services to handicapped children of school age;
(3) Career education opportunities for handicapped children;
(4) Development of an adequate special education personnel pool for the severely handicapped.

In the past, the Innovation and Development program has been criticized for its lack of clearly defined program goals and objectives, and its selection of particular research projects for funding. However, several changes in funding strategy planned in FY 73 have been implemented in FY 74 in order to improve the effectiveness of the program. Research funds not previously committed for continuation costs will be targeted on specific projects solicited by RFP's and a specific grant announcement. Projects on both a contract and grant basis will be selected systematically to fill gaps in the knowledge base. The new targeted program reflects a reassessment and prioritization of research issues, based on advice from professionals and constituent groups obtained through conferences and panel meetings.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations:

None

Source of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Media Services and Captioned Films

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part F-
Instructional Media for the
Handicapped, Sec. 652 and 653; as amended by
P.L. 93-380, Sec. 620

Expiration Date:

Indefinite

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965		$ 1,384,000
	1966		2,800,000
	1967	$ 3,000,000	2,800,000
	1968	8,000,000	2,800,000
	1969	8,000,000	4,750,000
	1970	10,000,000	4,750,000
	1971	12,500,000	6,000,000
	1972	15,000,000	10,478,000
	1973	20,000,000	12,968,000
	1974		13,000,000
	1975	18,000,000	13,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides the handicapped learner with specific educational materials to make it possible for him (her) to be educated effectively. This purpose is being advanced through the operation of a National Center for Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped, and a system other special purpose centers. An equally important mission is the original Congressional mandate: to promote the general welfare of deaf persons by captioning and distributing motion picture films which play an important role in their advancement on both a general cultural and an educational basis. In both cases the purpose of this program is to provide for maximum access to learning experiences by handicapped children through the development and efficient management of both material and human resources. In 1975, Special Education Instructional Materials Centers and Regional Media Centers will be transformed to a single type of regional center: Area Learning Resource Centers (ALRC).

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

During FY 1974, the national system provided materials and techniques for educating handicapped children through 13 Instructional Materials Centers, 4 Media Centers for the Deaf, and over 300 State and local "associate centers" established with the assistance of the national system.

In addition, films distributed to schools and classes for the deaf reached an audience of 3,000,000 people.

Reliable data on the impact of IMC/RMC centers on the education of handicapped children are not available. However, program management information has been collected.

Annual program reviews of the IMC/RMC system by the Bureau indicated that several system functions had overlapped among the various individual centers (e.g. computer retrieval of materials). Furthermore, these centers did not always have clearly defined spheres of responsibility apart from the Regional Resource Centers funded under Title VI-Part C. To make more efficient use of the total system resources, and to centralize the several system functions which had previously overlapped, the Congress authorized, under Sec. 653, EHA and the Bureau established a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped.

With regard to the film distribution services, the Bureau has obtained limited cost-effectiveness data. They show that the search for new and more economical measures of film delivery has lowered the cost per viewer to 12 cents, and more efficient distribution methods have expanded the average showings per print per year by 33% to 18 showings. Plans are underway to supply training films and other educational media on a no-cost basis to teachers of all handicapped children.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Source of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Specific Learning Disabilities

Legislation:

P.L. 91-230, Title VI, Part G-
Special Programs for Children With
Specific Learning Disabilities;

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1977

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969		
	1970	$12,000,000	$ 1,000,000
	1971	20,000,000	1,000,000
	1972	31,000,000	2,250,000
	1973	31,000,000	2,750,000
	1974		3,250,000
	1975	10,000,000	3,250,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to stimulate State and local provision of comprehensive identification, diagnostic, prescriptive and educational services for all children with specific learning disabilities (1 to 3 percent of the school-aged population) through the funding of model programs, and supportive technical assistance, research, and training activities. Competitive grants or contracts for this purpose are made to public and other nonprofit organizations.

Program Scope:

In 1974, the program established and maintained model projects in 45 States with the intention of encouraging these States to develop and implement a plan for serving all of the learning disabled children within their boundaries. Each project has as program components: a model learning disabilities program, an evaluation of the program's objectives and goals, a determination of the validity of the model and a statewide plan for implementation of that model. These program components are supported by technical and developmental assistance. Approximately 4300 children participated in these programs in 1974. An additional 8,000 children were served by replicated projects from current and past projects, 1,300 regular classroom teachers received inservice training, 2,500 parents received counseling, and 1,500 parents were provided with materials and information.

Program Effectiveness:

There is relatively little validated information on the impact of this program, particularly on the effectiveness of its intended "multiplier" effect at the State level.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of this program will be implemented in the Fall, 1975.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

C. VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education - Basic Grants to States

Legislation: Expiration Date:

Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended 1968, Part B — Permanent

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION*
	1965	$156,641,000	$156,446,000
	1966	209,741,000	209,741,000
	1967	252,491,000	248,216,000
	1968	252,491,000	249,300,000
	1969	314,500,000	248,216,000
	1970	503,500,000	300,336,000
	1971	602,500,000	315,302,000
	1972	602,500,000	376,682,000
	1973	508,500,000	376,682,000
	1974	508,500,000	405,347,000
	1975	508,500,000	405,347,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are made to the States to assist them in conducting vocational education programs for persons of all ages with the objective of insuring that vocational education and training programs are available to all individuals who desire and need such education and training for gainful employment. States are required to set aside 15 percent for vocational education for the disadvantaged; 15 percent for post-secondary programs; and 10 percent for vocational education for the handicapped. Funds may be used for the construction of area vocational education facilities. States are required to match one dollar for every Federal dollar.

Under the provisions of P.L. 92-318, the definition of vocational and technical education has been expanded to include industrial arts education and the training of volunteer firemen.

---

* This does not include the permanent authorization and appropriation of $7.1 million apportioned to the States each year under the Smith-Hughes Act.

Program Scope:

According to FY 1973 reports, 12,072,445 students were enrolled in vocational education programs. Of these, 7,353,962 were enrolled in secondary schools; 1,349,721 in postsecondary schools. Adult enrollees were classified as 595,329 preparatory, 2,596,258 supplemental and 177,165 apprenticeship.

Enrollments in Part B setasides for disadvantaged and handicapped students were as follows:

Disadvantaged:

Secondary		1,122,576
Postsecondary		184,878
Adult		293,925
	Total	1,601,379

Handicapped:

Secondary		161,635
Postsecondary		30,736
Adult		35,715
	Total	228,086

Enrollments in all categories except disadvantaged increased from FY 1972 to FY 1973. The slight decline in enrollment from previous years for disadvantaged students may be due to improved reporting for this category and the offering of other vocational options. (See Special Need Section.)

Construction of Facilities FY 73

In FY 1973, Federal, State, and local funds totaling over 228.2 million were committed for 368 area vocational school construction projects. During 1965 through 1973 over 2.1 billion dollars of Federal, State, and local funds have been spent in 3009 projects to increase the capacity of area vocational schools through expansion, remodeling, and new construction by over 2.2 million.

The funds approved for expenditure in FY 73 were:

	Funds Approved (Millions) 1973
Vocational Education Act (1963 and 1968 Amendments)	35.4
Appalachian Regional Commission (1965)	27.8
Economic Development Act (1965)	5.4
State and local funds	159.6
TOTAL	228.2

A breakdown of funding by source of funds for fiscal year 1965 through 1972 is:

	Funds Approved (Millions) 1965-1973
Vocational Education Act (1963 and 1968 Amendments)	470.6
Appalachian Regional Commission (1965)	190.9
Economic Development Act (1965)	77.7
State and local funds	1,422.4
TOTAL	2,161.6

Program data at the Federal level are generally limited to enrollment and expenditure data from required State plans and annual reports submitted by State education agencies. They are often incomplete. GAO and program monitoring reports document the difficulties of the data. There is no established procedure for the development of response material for specific data requirements which are not included in the basic reporting system. Data are being collected by NCES through studies such as "Survey of Vocational Education Student and Teacher Characteristics in Public Schools, 1972."

The NCES study, using a stratified sample of programs, surveyed about 2,600 teachers and 45,000 students. The survey was designed to cover all public secondary-, postsecondary-, and adult-level vocational education classes in occupational curriculum taught in secondary schools, plus that portion of vocational education offered by school districts, area vocational schools, and other public secondary school systems.

The study indicated that sex distributions varied greatly by program area, except for distributive education, where the men and women were almost equally divided. The other seven fields were largely dominated by one or the other, as follows:

Predominantly men		Predominantly women	
Agriculture	93.7	Health	80.7
Technical education	88.1	Home economics (homemaking)	90.2
Trades and industry	85.6	Home economics (occupational)	85.5
		Office or business	83.2

The racial/ethnic distribution for total secondary vocational enrollment from minority groups (American Indian, Black, Oriental, and Spanish-speaking) was 23 percent.

Program Effectiveness:

Evaluation data indicate that participation in vocational education programs does increase earnings; however, more information is needed about the characteristics of vocational education students, including their performance and attitudes after they leave the program. Data from the National Longitudinal Study and analysis of data from other studies such as the NCES surveys are providing additional insights into these questions.

Analysis of Base Year Data of the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972:

The analysis is designed to provide a partial evaluation of the effects of major legislation in vocational education. Specifically, the analysis is a re-evaluation of the base-year data and is concentrated in three specific areas: (1) educational characteristics of students and selected univariate explorations; (2) multivariate explorations distinguishing vocational/technical students from others; (3) student vocational and educational plans and aspirations. Part I, Selected Characteristics of the Class of 1972 of the Final Report has been recieved by USOE. Parts II and III are to be delivered in January 1975.

Some of the findings from Part I of the Final Report include: The socioeconomic status (SES) of the sample of 18,000 students was examined from a variety of viewpoints, with highly consistent results. The SES level of academic students was appreciably higher than that of general students who had, in turn, a slightly higher SES level than that of vocational technical students. Blacks were found to have markedly lower SES than whites.

A set of six tests (vocabulary, picture-number, reading, letter groups, mathematics, and mosiac comparisons) were administered to the sample students. Uniformly, females slightly outperformed males, academic students outperformed other students, and Blacks scored about a standard deviation below whites. Exceptions to this pattern include the fact that males slightly outperformed females in mathematics. The median class standing of females was substantially (17%) higher than males and that of vocational/technical students was about 6% higher than that of general students.

An Assessment of Vocational Education Programs for Handicapped Students:

The study reviewed the operation and administration of the Part B setaside for handicapped students in 25 States, selected randomly with a probability proportionate to total enrollments in the 50 States. A total of 92 projects were visited for the project level assessment. A total of 1,001 student and parent interviews was conducted in five of the sample States, 681 with students currently enrolled and 320 with students who had completed projects. A sample of participating and nonparticipating employers were interviewed.

Findings indicate that Part B setasides have resulted in projects which would have never occurred had there been no such legislation. About 93 percent of the funds were used to provide direct services to students. Cost and outcome data were seriously deficient at both the state and local levels. However, according to what little data was available, including results of the student, parent and employer interviews, the program appeared to be working well. Costs per student and completer were not excessive and placement rates ranged from 48 to 60 percent for completers. About 33 percent reenrolled in school, and only about 15 percent of the completers were unemployed.

There is little long-term planning at the State or local level. Planning was limited to review of project proposals and decisions as to which proposals would be funded, generally on the basis of the sizes of school districts and other formulas. Factors which mitigated against planning at the state level were the independence of the local education agencies and the fact that only one person was assigned to administer the setaside program.

At the project level, few examples of individualized instruction were found, except to the extent that "hands on" vocational training was practiced. Although most local administrators indicated that it was the school district policy to integrate the handicapped with regular students, about 70% of the students enrolled were in "special" classes. A constraint to "mainstreaming" as well as the lack of experience in dealing with these populations appeared in the audit and reporting system. States in Region V appeared to be further along in integrating classes.

One of the most often mentioned constraints limiting the expansion of vocational education programs for the handicapped was the reluctance of teachers in regular classes to accept the handicapped, or the inability of teachers to instruct handicapped students.

Two-thirds of the training provided under the setaside programs was nonskills training, that is, training not intended to prepare students to compete in the open labor market in any given skill, craft or trade. Half of the students enrolled in this type of training were in prevocational training. Others were enrolled in diagnostic centers, mobility training, nongainful home economics, industrial arts, tutoring and sheltered workshop programs. About 12% were trainables. Of those enrolled in skills training, the vast majority were in trade and industrial courses, mainly for men. The range of occupational offerings for women was extremely narrow, being confined mainly to home economics (much of which was not gainful), and health occupations.

In half of the projects included in the project sample, at least some students were referred into work experience programs. Most of the work stations were unskilled work activities and were intended mainly to provide students with "work experience."

Only a few projects received a thorough assessment of the educational needs of the handicapped students referred to the program.

The case study interviews indicated that both students and parents expressed extremely favorable attitudes toward the projects in which they or their children were enrolled.

Participating employers expressed favorable attitudes toward the program. Three out of four participating employers rated the performance of handicapped students and/or completer "as good" or "better than" regular workers in each of the eight performance scales.

Unlike participating employers, nonparticipating employers expressed the belief that it would be necessary to effect radical changes in their working environments if they were to hire the handicapped.

The study also raised questions about combining handicapped and disadvantaged set aside provisions and indicated that there was some evidence that some States may not be expending 10 percent of their basic grants on programs for the handicapped.

What is the Role of Federal Assistance for Vocational Education? Report to Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States:

Although expanded vocational opportunities have been made available for the disadvantaged and handicapped, persons with special needs have not been given high priority, the GAO report says. The report further maintains that vocational education programs are not responsive to changes in the labor market, have shown bias against women and do not provide adequate occupational guidance and job placement assistance. The report is based on a review of programs in seven States.

The report maintains that these States have distributed funds in a variety of ways, many of which do not necessarily result in funds being targeted to geographical areas of need, or providing for the programmatic initiatives called for by law. Some major practices noted were: making funds available to all local education agencies within a State, rather than concentrating funds in selected areas with high needs; making funds available to local agencies without adequately identifying the relative need for the program; and making funds available without considering ability of local agencies to provide their own resources.

Greater attention to systematic, coordinated planning at the national, State and local levels would improve the use of Federal funds, the report suggests. State and local plans reflect compliance rather than planning. Data that would be helpful to planning is unavailable, inadequate or unutilized, the report continues.

Practical Career Guidance, Counseling, and Placement for the Non-College-Bound Student:

This study reviewed data concerned with the practical career guidance and counseling for noncollege-bound students. The report's findings indicate that women, minority, and disadvantaged students have not obtained sufficient occupational information and assistance in relating their abilities and interests to career options. Furthermore, the overall conclusion drawn was that the guidance and counseling personnel resources generally have not been aligned to provide practical career guidance for noncollege-bound students despite national priorities and allocations of funds. Recognizing the need for realignment of the counseling services for the noncollege-bound, the report recommends that 1) guidance and counseling experts provide more specific information and 2) realignment be based on a planning model that includes assessment of the priority of target groups, selection of appropriate strategies, and evaluation of efforts.

A Comparative Study of Proprietary and Non-Proprietary Vocational Training Program:

A study of 51 proprietary and 14 non-proprietary schools in four cities examined student outcomes in four occupational areas; office, health, computer and technical occupations. About 7,000 students and 5,200 alumni were queried.

Findings indicate that 78 percent of the graduates sought training related jobs and three-quarters of these persons found training-related jobs. However, less than 20% of the proprietary alumni and only 13% of the non-proprietary alumni obtained jobs through school placement service, a surprising result especially for proprietary schools, since virtually all offer placement assistance. Most graduates indicated satisfaction with their current job status. Of those alumni currently employed, about 34% of the proprietary and 12% of the non-proprietary group felt that the training was definitely not worh the money.

Cost benefit measures indicate that the investment in vocational training was worthwhile for all o-cupational groups except the computer trainees in proprietary schools. Non-proprietary school graduates have an advantage over proprietary school graduates in cost-benefit measures and in salary gain comparing before training to the first job in training. However, non-proprietary alumni overall earned less before training than proprietary graduates. Proprietary and non-proprietary schools differ substantially in their operations and program offerings; however, the student enrolled in both types of schools are very similar in terms of background and motivational characteristics. Most are young high school graduates enrolled in full-time programs with a goal of obtaining full-time jobs. A sizeable proportion of the students (30% proprietary and, 42% non-proprietary) belong to minority ethnic groups. Accredited schools and chain schools surveyed are no more effective in placing graduates than non-accredited and non-chain schools. Cities surveyed include: Chicago, Illinois; Atlanta, Georgia; San Francisco, California; and Rochester, New York.

Vocational Education Impact Study:

Findings from the Vocational Impact Study, a three-part study completed in 1972, provide detailed analyses of data from recent studies of vocational students. This data examines the impact of the 1968 amendments and information about the duplication, gaps and coordination of publicly funded skill training programs in 20 cities.

Of all studies analyzed, the National Longitudinal surveys (also called the Parnes study) provides the most recent and probably the most reliable data about vocational education. The Parnes study confirms that enrollees of vocational programs do benefit from vocational training and suggests that the influence of vocational education on earnings is more closely related to changes in labor market conditions than had been thought to be the case before. In periods of low unemployment, vocational students entering the labor market fare better than nonvocational students; however, in high unemployment areas employers have more choices of job candidates and their priorities appear to be 1) the experienced worker and 2) the vocational graduate who has acquired skill training. Unskilled persons are last hired.

Another study, a case study of three cities, shows that high school graduates from vocational curriculum in the instances surveyed experienced 5 to 10 percentage points more time employed during the six-year follow-up period than was the case with the graduates of the academic curriculum who did not attend college.

Impact of 1968 Amendments:

For disadvantaged and handicapped populations, there appears to be no relationship between the degree to which a State expended Federal set-aside funds and the investment of State/local funds for these target groups. Data indicate that these were low priority areas in some States and while most States have a formula for establishing priorities, some did not fully expend the Federal set-asides for these groups, the Vocational Impact Study reports.

However, data indicates that post-secondary programs have a high priority in most States and matching ratios also indicate a much greater State/local effort in this category than required by law. The most rapid growth in vocational enrollments in the past five years has taken place in the post-secondary programs.

A Study of Duplication, Gaps and Coordination of Publicly Funded Skill in Training Programs in 20 cities:

Data on more than 390,000 enrollees in 20 cities indicate that 65% were enrolled in secondary vocational education programs. Of the remaining 35 percent who participated in Federal manpower programs, over two-thirds were enrolled in occupational programs in post-secondary institutions. Analysis of enrollee characteristics data indicate that vocational programs and manpower programs serve different populations. Most manpower enrollees are those over 18 years of age with 6th to 10th grade level of educational attainment. Such enrollees rarely find a place in postsecondary institutions which usually have some form of restriction on entering skills training programs even where there is a policy of open admissions, the report concludes.

Several manpower programs, notably Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps, offer skill training to the high school age group normally served by secondary vocational programs. These programs, serving only approximately 2% of the secondary school-aiged students, are mainly for dropouts. They offer the same occupational skills which are available in the better public secondary programs, although the manpower program offers considerably more services in terms of guidance, remedial education, placement and job coaching.

Planned and Ongoing Studies:

Analysis of the First-Year Follow-Up Data of the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972:

This study will examine the educational and occupational decisions made by vocational education students, during the period between the Base Year and First Year Follow-up Data Collections. The study will examine career and employment patterns in the year immediately following the completion of their secondary education and the factors which affect the career patters of these youth. Several analytical path models will be created to explain the causal relationship, if any, between their career decisions and hereditary and environmental variables (race, sex, school location, SES, etc.) These path models will be compared with those developed for both academic and general curriculum students to determine the differential effects or impacts of the different educational experiences.

An Assessment of the Vocational Education Programs for Disadvantaged Students:

This study will provide information about the planning, administration and evaluation of programs for the disadvantaged and special target populations at the State level. Administrative and organizational designs of vocational programs serving these students at the school or project level will also be reviewed. The study will examine the extent to which work experience components are present in programs for these populations, the quality of the work stations, and the necessary conditions under which expansion is possible.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

An Assessment of Vocational Education Programs for the Handicapped Under Part B of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act. Olympus Research Corporation, October 1974.

A Vocational Re-Evaluation of the Base Year Survey of the High School Class of 1972,(Part I: Selected Characteristics of the Class of 1972). Educational Testing Service, October 1974.

National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972. Educational Testing Service, June 1973. (Study under auspices of NCES)

Major City Secondary Education Systems: Class of 1970 Follow-up Survey of Vocational Program Graduates. Educational Systems Research Institute, December 1972.

Practical Career Guidance, Counseling and placement for the Noncollege-Bound Students. American Institutes for Research, June 1973.

The Vocational Impact Study: Policy Issues and Analytical Problems in Evaluating Vocational Education: A Study of the State Grant Mechanism; and A Study of Duplication, Gaps, and Coordination of Publicly Funded Skill Training Programs in 20 Cities. National Planning Association, October 1972.

A Comparative Study of Proprietary and Non-Proprietary Vocational Training Programs. American Institutes for Research, November 1972.

National Longitudinal Surveys, Survey of Work Experience of Males, 14-24, 1966, and Survey of Work Experience of Young Men, 1968, Center for Human Resources Research, Ohio State University, and U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of Census, 1966 and 1968, often referred to as the Parnes Study.

A Cost Effective Study of Vocational Education: A comparison of Vocational and nonvocational Education in Secondary Schools. Pennsylvania State University, 1969.

The Effectiveness of Vocational and Technical Education, Center for Vocational and Technical Education, University of Wisconsin, 1971.

Trends in Vocational Education, USOE, June 1970.

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

Reports from State Advisory Committees

Reports from the National Advisory Committee

What is the Role of Federal Assistance for Vocational Education? Report to Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States. December 31, 1974

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education - Program for Students with Special Needs

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Vocational Education Act of 1963 as amended 1968, Part A, Section 102 (b)	June 30, 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1969	$40,000,000	-0-
	1970	40,000,000	$20,000,000
	1971	50,000,000	20,000,000
	1972	60,000,000	20,000,000
	1973	60,000,000	20,000,000
	1974	60,000,000	20,000,000
	1975	60,000,000	20,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Grants are allocated to the States by formula, with no matching required, to assist in providing support for programs and services for persons who are unable to succeed in regular vocational programs because of poor academic background, lack of motivation, and/or depressing environmental factors. Programs are concentrated within the States in communities where there is a high incidence of youth unemployment and high school dropouts. Special services and programs are provided these youth and adults to encourage them to stay in school to acquire the academic and occupational skills needed for successful employment or to continue to pursue their career preparation.

Special services provide specially trained teachers in remedial and bilingual specialties, staff aides, additional counseling services, facilities accessible to a high concentration of these students, and instructional materials and equipment best suited to their needs and abilities.

Some of the areas where these funds have been expended are those where English is a second language, rural depressed communities, low-cost housing developments in the inner city, correctional institutions, and off-reservation locations with a predominance of American Indians.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

Program data indicate that enrollment under Section 102(b) declined from 191,000 students in FY 1972 to 146,482 in FY 1973. The decline in enrollment from previous years was said to be caused by increases per pupil expenditures. These increases are a result of ...

(1) inflation, which in turn results in higher staff salaries and higher equipment prices;

(2) more intensive diagnostic and evaluation procedures requiring additional staff and materials, and

(3) increased emphasis on staff development programs

Other reasons given for the reported drop in enrollments are:

(4) improved reporting for this category; program audits have forced States to improve reporting procedures and to discontinue reporting students as enrollees who were eligible but who did not receive direct services

(5) possibly the availability of other vocational education options.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

State Advisory Council Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education-Research and Training

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Vocational Education Act of 1963 as amended 1968, Part C	None

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	$11,850,000	$11,850,000
	1966	17,750,000	17,750,000
	1967	22,500,000	10,000,000
	1968	22,500,000	13,550,000
	1969	35,500,000	11,550,000
	1970	56,000,000	1,100,000
	1971	67,500,000	35,750,000
	1972	67,500,000	18,000,000
	1973	67,500,000	18,000,000
	1974	67,500,000	18,000,000
	1975	67,500,000	18,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

From Fiscal 1965 through Fiscal 1969, all research funds appropriated under the Vocational Education Act were reserved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education for direct Federal grants and contracts. This arrangement was modified by Part C of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, which provided for a division of the funds between the Commissioner and the State Board for Vocational Education. 50% of the sums available went to institutions of higher education, public and private agencies, and with State board approval - to local education agencies. The remaining 50% of the funds available to the State are used by the Board in accordance with its State plan.

The Part C funds are used for research; for training programs to familiarize personnel with research results and products; for developmental, experimental, or pilot programs designed to meet the special vocational needs of youth, especially the disadvantaged; for demonstration and dissemination projects; and for establishing and operating State Research Coordinating Units (RCU's).

The RCU is the officially designated unit located in a State Department of Education or a State university which administers the State's vocational research programs and disseminates research findings to administrators, teachers and counselors, and teacher educators. Many RCU's now operate extensive information retrieval and dissemination systems linked to and based on the ERIC system. Other RCU functions include: coordinating Statewide and local evaluation studies, assisting in State planning efforts, and coordinating State-administered Exemplary Projects under Part D of the Vocational Education Act.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In Fiscal 1974 the Commissioner's portion of the Part C funds went into five priority areas: (1) Comprehensive Systems of Guidance, Counseling, Placement and Student Follow-up Services, (2) Manpower Information Systems, (3) Curriculum Studies, (4) Alternative Work Experience Programs and, (5) Disadvantaged, Handicapped and Minority Studies. These ninety-three projects produce information, products and materials to improve and extend existing Vocational Education programs.

Also during Fiscal 74, State funds under Part C supported approximately 425 grants or contracts. Priority areas which received attention were: career education, problems of disadvantaged students, cost-effectiveness and cost-benefits of programs and services, improvement of State and local administration of vocational education, program and system evaluation, new and emerging occupational areas, vocational guidance, follow-up studies of graduates, and employment needs of specific communities.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The State-administered research projects and the State RCU's were evaluated by the State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education as part of their overall responsibility for evaluating all programs covered by the State Plan for Vocational Education.

In addition, the Office of Education is negotiating a contract with the National Academy of Science to perform a comprehensive study of the planning, management, and impact of the Federal vocational education research program since its inception in 1965. The study is planned for completion in Fiscal 1976. Also, "Project Baseline," a Federally-funded national study of the vocational education programs, includes a component to gather information on the effects of OE funded vocational education research.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Survey of Vocational Education Student and Teacher Characteristics in Public Secondary Schools, 1972. Westat, Inc. Rockville, Md., 1973. (OE Contract OEC-0-72-4577)

Annual State Vocational Education Reports (State Board funds)

State Advisory Council Reports (State programs)

Annual RCU Reports

Meetings w/NAS, progress reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education -- Exemplary Programs

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Vocational Education Act of 1963 as amended 1968, Part D	June 30, 1975

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1969	$15,000,000	-0-
	1970	57,500,000	$13,000,000
	1971	75,000,000	16,000,000
	1972	75,000,000	16,000,000
	1973	75,000,000	16,000,000
	1974	75,000,000	16,000,000
	1975	75,000,000	16,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are awarded to the States for the purpose of stimulating new ways of creating bridges between school and employment for young people, who: (a) are still in school, (b) have left school either by graduation or by dropping out, or (c) are in postsecondary programs of vocational preparation. Additional purposes are the promotion of cooperation between public education and manpower agencies and the broadening of occupational aspirations and opportunities for young people, especially those who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps.

Fifty percent of the appropriation is reserved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education for discretionary grants or contracts to support projects carried out in the States. The remaining 50 percent is allocated to the State Boards for Vocational Education for use in the same manner. Funds reserved by the Commissioner are available until expended and funds alloted to State Boards are available for two fiscal years.

The Federally-administered discretionary projects are distributed geogrpahically across the States, as required by law, with at least one project in operation in each State. The typical project is funded at a level of about $130,000 per year for a three-year period, with the exact amount determined by formula. The funds appropriated in fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972 supported the first three-year cycle of projects, most of which began in the spring of 1970 and ended in the spring of 1973.

The Federally-administered, discretionary projects have been major contributors to the National thrust in career education. The career education techniques and instructional materials emerging from the first three-year cycle of

Part D discretionary projects provided input to the design and development of the National Institute of Education's School-Based Career Education Model. These same techniques and materials provided input into the pilot career education projects initiated in FY 1972 and FY 1973 with discretionary funds from Part C of the Vocational Education Act. In addition, these Part D projects have served as demonstration sites within each State, providing operational examples of career education functioning in local settings.

State-administered Part D projects are in operation in all States, utilizing the 50 percent of the appropriation allotted to the State Boards for Vocational Education. In FY 1973, approximately 400 State-administered Part D projects were in operation, many of which represented continuations of projects initiated in FY 1971 or FY 1972. About 200 of these projects were focused on various aspects and components of career education, including projects focused on guidance, counseling and placement.

In a number of States, such as Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Georgia, Mississippi, Wyoming, and Oregon, a systematic, Statewide plan had already been formulated for the development and diffusion of career education. These plans provided for coordination through the State Research Coordinating Unit (RCU), which is supported under Part C of the Vocational Education Act. These Statewide plans generally used the discretionary Part D project as a focal point for career education model-building. The plan then involved diffusion of tested career-education components to other school districts throughout the State, utilizing State-administered Part D and Part C funds as well as funds from other sources (such as the Appalachian Regional Commission) to assist school districts in adapting and implementing the career education programs.

Program Scope:

Federally-administered, FY 1974 funds were used by the U.S.O.E. Regional Officers to continue 10 projects into their third year of operation, 50 projects into their second year and to initiate 5 new projects, one in each of the States and Territories of Florida, Minnesota, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territories. As in prior years, these projects were focused on demonstrating comprehensive career education programs.

State-administered FY 1974 funds were used to initiate or continue about 400 projects. While statistical information is not available, it can be estimated that about 50% of the projects were once again focused on career education.

Program Effectiveness:

All Federally-administered projects have included provisions for a "third-party" evaluator; The funds provided for each grant cover the costs, and the project director is responsible for arranging a sub-contract with an outside agency to evaluate his project. A copy of the evaluation report for each completed project is provided to the OE Program administrators. Where available, they are read individually in connection with decisions about further funding. However, the diversity of evaluation designs and the range of instruments used have not permitted generalizations about all of the projects.

In June, 1973 a contract (OEC-0-73-6663) was awarded to Development Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C. for an evaluation of the Vocational Exemplary Projects. Fifty site visits to Federally-funded projects were made to gather information about each program's effectiveness as a demonstration project, costs, and impact on students. The study also gathered information on State-administered projects through visits to State Departments to obtain data on the dissemination and replication of exemplary projects, funding patterns, and costs within the State. Out of concern with the diversity in the 3rd party evaluations of the first 3-year round of Part D projects and the resulting inability to draw generalizations, the work of Development Associates was set aside in June, 1974, with an amendment to their contract by the Office of Education for the development of Guidelines for the Evaluation of Career Education Programs. Completed in September, 1974, these Evaluation Models are now being used by many of the Part D projects to systematize and improve the work of their 3rd party evaluators. Development Associates has resumed their analysis of data and is doing field testing of the Evaluation Model. This is scheduled for completion by September 30, 1975.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Site-visits to fifty projects by Development Associates, Inc., information from the Bureau of Adult and Vocational Eduation, and data being gathered from field tests of the Evaluation Model.

On-going

The work described above is proceeding according to schedule. In addition to a revised Evaluation Model, it will yield a suggested information system for further development by the Office of Career Education which might also be utilized by the Exemplary Projects Staff.

Program Name:

Vocational Education - Consumer and Homemaking Education

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended in 1968, Part F, Consumer and Homemaking Education	June 30, 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969		
	1970	$25,000,000	$15,000,000
	1971	35,000,000	21,250,000
	1972	50,000,000	25,625,000
	1973	50,000,000	25,625,000
	1974	50,000,000	30,994,000
	1975	50,000,000	30,994,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 and Part F of the Vocational Amendments of 1968 provide formula grants to States for programs in Consumer and Homemaking Education. States must use at least one-third of the Federal funds allocated for programs in economically depressed areas or areas with high rates of unemployment where matching is 90 percent Federal and 10 percent State and/or local. The grants to States are to assist them in:

1) Offering education programs which provide instruction specifically for preparing youth and adults for the occupation of homemaking with emphasis on the dual role of homemaker and wage earner, thus contributing to their employability. Programs offered on the junior high, secondary, postsecondary, and adult levels provide instruction for: (a) the improvement of home environments and family life including child growth-development, and parent education; (b) for developing competencies which contribute to employability including programs in management, nutrition and interpersonal relations, and other homemaking skills; and (c) for improvement of consumer behavior by including consumer education as an integral part of all instructional programs; and as a separate independent course to all individuals regardless of objectives. 2) Providing ancillary services and other activities which assure quality in all consumer and homemaking education programs. Ancillary services and activities include support of: (a) State and local supervisory staffs who provide leadership for program development and for the

Future Homemakers of America, the vocational student organization which is an integral part of the instructional programs; (b) preservice and inservice education for teachers through workshops, conferences, and individual consultation; (c) curriculum development with special emphasis on consumer education, nutrition education, family life and parent education and programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped, particularly the economically depressed; (d) research, pilot-demonstration programs evaluation with leadership development for graduate students and (e) start-up of innovative programs in consumer and homemaking education.

Program Scope

Since the passage of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, total enrollments in consumer and homemaking education in programs which received Federal funds have increased 49.9 percent--from a total of 2,129,727 in Fiscal Year 1967 to 3,193,987 in Fiscal Year 1973. There were 644,047 persons enrolled in programs in the depressed areas. Enrollments have increased in consumer and homemaking. Some areas of home economics have had a greater growth than others, which may reflect some of the particular educational needs of individuals today; for example, food and nutrition had the biggest increase in enrollment, next was child development, then clothing and textiles, next was consumer education, etc.

Evidence of the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking education is difficult to quantify and changes in attitudes and habits do not result over a short period of time.

Evidence of Growth of Enrollment in Consumer and Homemaking Education Programs is Shown in the Table Below:

Area of Home Economics	Enrollment FY 67	Enrollment FY 72	Enrollment FY 73
Consumer and Homemaking (total)	2,199,727	3,164,292	3,193,987
Child Development	64,812	138,589	172,976
Clothing and Textiles	285,964	364,659	398,272
Consumer Education	4,924	102,055	130,164
Family Relations	95,367	190,397	209,973
Food and Nutrition	62,348	222,252	303,455
Home Management	38,576	55,897	60,931
Housing and Home Furnishings	73,576	105,296	124,651
Comprehensive Consumer and Homemaking and Others	1,428,190	1,792,540	1,993,566

Estimated enrollments for Fiscal Year 1974 is 3,435,000.

Ongoing and Planned Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

Descriptive Reports submitted by State Departments of Education, State Supervisors of Home Economics

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education - Cooperative Vocational Education Programs

Legislation: Expiration Date:

VEA of 1963, as amended 1968, Part G June 30, 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965		
	1966		
	1967		
	1968		
	1969	$20,000,000	-0-
	1970	35,000,000	$14,000,000
	1971	50,000,000	18,500,000
	1972	75,000,000	19,500,000
	1973	75,000,000	19,500,000
	1974	75,000,000	19,500,000
	1975	75,000,000	19,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are made to the States to support cooperative education programs which involve arrangement between schools and employers, enabling students to receive vocational instruction in the school and related on-the-job training through part-time employment. Priority is given to areas where there is high incidence of student dropouts and youth unemployment. Students must be at least 14 years old and are paid by the employer either a minimum wage or a student-learner rate established by the Department of Labor. Federal support may cover program operation, added training cost to employers, payment for services or unusual costs to students while training, and ancillary services. Federal funds may be used for all or part of a State's expenditure for programs authorized and approved under State Plan provisions.

Part G, cooperative vocational education programs, have extended the range of occupations for which training can be offered, to such areas as marketing and distribution, business and office, trade and industrial, and health occupations. In addition, there was an emphasis on developing cooperative education programs for small communities which cut across several occupational fields in one program setting. Students could prepare for specific areas of gainful employment which were not available previously because of insufficient enrollment or lack of facilities to support specialized vocational programs. Most of the new programs were developed in areas with high rates of school dropouts and youth unemployment.

Part G programs were also provided in the earlier grades to facilitate exploration and development of general work attitudes and skills.

To involve more disadvantaged youth, increased emphasis was given to the implementation of special provisions under Part G which permit the reimbursement to employers for certain added costs incurred in providing on-the-job training and the payment of unusual costs associated with student participation in the program.

Program Scope:

In fiscal year 1973, 508,409 students were enrolled in cooperative education programs, of these 339,958 cooperative students were supported from Part B funds; 168,451 students from Part G.

Under Part G funds, 128,802 students were in secondary programs and 39,649 were in postsecondary.

Program Effectiveness:

The "Assessment of School-Supervised Work Education Programs", completed in 1973, examined the different configurations of work education programs to determine the degree to which different types of programs are meeting their intended objectives and to suggest ways in which different programs might be modified or expanded. A stratified random sample of 50 work education sites was drawn from 500 representative programs using three variables as the basis for the stratification. The 50 were distributed as follows on the basis of those variables determined as most relevant:

Education level: Secondary (36), postsecondary (14)

Primary purpose: Specific occupational training (30*), dropout prevention (14), career exploration (6)

Industrial setting: Farming region (15), bedroom community (11), single industry area (9), major industrial/business career (15)

---

* Specific occupational training programs are generally those funded under Part G. Findings relating to Work Study (or Dropout prevention) programs are reported in the following section which describes programs funded under Part H of the 1968 Amendments.

According to the study findings, cooperative education programs appear to be generating the most enthusiasm among students, employers, and school officials because they meet the expressed needs and objectives of all groups. Students feel that cooperative education programs are providing them with valuable job training. Employers feel that they are getting their money's worth from student workers and are contributing to their profession. School administrators and teachers are satisfied with the learning experiences and job placements after the training period.

Cooperative education programs are reported as more likely than other types of programs to: (1) provide students with job-related instruction in school; (2) provide job placement services and have a high rate of job-related placements; (3) help students decide on an occupation; and (4) provide students with jobs that fit into their career plans, offering a high level of responsibility and a high degree of satisfaction.

But there are some negative findings compared with other types of programs. Cooperative programs are (1) more apt to discriminate against students on the basis of student attitude; (2) less effective in reducing student absenteeism; (3) more apt to interfere with student's other activities in school and out; (4) more apt to segregate job placements by sex, and (5) more likely to restrict their offerings to students with rather conforming, middle-class behaviors.

Employers participating in secondary level work education programs, regardless of purpose, rated overall program quality significantly higher than did employers participating in postsecondary programs. However, with regard to placements and quality of training, the postsecondary occupational training programs were superior to their secondary counterparts.

The employer ratings of individual work education students proved to be a very significant variable in gaining an understanding of work education programs. For students, a higher rating by the employer was associated with greater job satisfaction, and for employers a higher average rating of his students was associated with a higher rating of overall program quality. Thus, careful matching of students to jobs which meet student career objectives, appears to be one of the most crucial tasks for work education programs, in terms of both student satisfaction and employer acceptance.

Pay factors played an important role in determining the way the employers in the study sample viewed work education programs. Where students were paid less than regular employees, employers were significantly more likely to rate the program's overall quality as excellent.

From the student's point of view, pay plays a minor and somewhat ambiguous role: students who are paid for their work are slightly, but not statistically significantly more satisfied with their jobs than students who are not paid. But the attitude of those not paid toward school is likely to improve after joining the program.

The industrial /community setting in which the program was located played a minor role regarding characteristics of the various work education programs. Most variations found were expected--for instance, pay rates and the proportion of ethnic minorities involved were higher in urban areas than elsewhere. The one surprising finding was that the level of a student's satisfaction with his job was significantly higher among programs in rural settings than among programs in any of the other three types of settings.

Postsecondary programs are more effective than those at secondary school level in nearly all aspects; specifically, these programs scored higher on job-related instruction, job-related placements, student follow-up, helping students to decide on an occupation, and providing them with jobs that fit into their career plans, jobs with high responsibility ratings, and jobs with which they are highly satisfied. Two exceptions were found, however; employers rated secondary students higher than those from postsecondary educational institutions, and secondary students earn slightly more than do postsecondary school student workers.

Two components of student satisfaction were considered in this study. First, how do (1) students participating in work education programs, and (2) vocational students who are not participating in work education programs but who are holding jobs compared with respect to (1) their degree of satisfaction with the jobs they held, and (2) improvement in their satisfaction toward school after they joined the work education program or began working. The two student groups differed little in terms of their satisfaction with school increased to a significantly greater degree among students participating in work education programs than among those working but not involved with the program. The most important influences on the student's job satisfaction were how well he was rated by his employer and the degree to which he felt this job afforded him responsibility.

A high level of job responsibility also had a positive impact in improving a student's attitude toward school. (Other than this, only such non-manipulable background characteristics as ethnicity, sex and age appeared to influence changes in satisfaction with school after a student enrolled in the work education program).

The study was also concerned with determining to what degree these programs were fostering discriminatory practices. It was found that while no programs would admit to overt discrimination, subtler forms were rather common. Thus, while the majority of the programs were integrated, only 30 percent of the interviewed employers had been assigned students of more than one race. Sexual stereotypes were being fostered in a similar manner with only 39 percent of the employers receiving students of both sexes.

Cost Effectiveness of Selected Cooperative Vocational Programs:

This exploratory study examined data from 11 school districts in 3 States to obtain cost comparisons from cooperative vocational education programs and regular vocational progams.

Effectiveness comparisons were based on standard follow-up information provided by the schools. In addition, a brief survey of employers was conducted, to obtain their attitudes about graduates of cooperative programs versus graduates of non-cooperative programs. Although school data indicated no obvious difference in the work experience of the two groups, the employer survey showed a definite difference. The sample of employers favored graduates of co-op programs (59 percent over those of non co-op), (4 percent non-co-op with 37 percent indicating no difference). School data indicated that the co-op students have little difficulty finding jobs and that a substantial percentage of co-op students (46 percent) were able to continue full-time employment with their co-op employer.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The second phase of the Assessment of School-Supervised Work Education Programs will provide (1) outcome information for the 1900 students identified as program participants and the non-participant control group, about 18 months after they graduated or left school; (2) an additional sample of 30 case studies which focus on secondary and postsecondary cooperative education programs in urban areas. The first case studies focused on the widest range of programs. Findings are fairly clear as to the success of small cooperative education programs in serving persons from middle-class background and attitudes. They were less conclusive (partially because of the size of the sample) about the viability and the constraints of cooperative education programs in inner city settings, in larger school districts, and those serving large numbers of minority, handicapped or persons with special needs. This second phase is scheduled to be completed in the fall of 1975.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

An Assessment of School-Supervised Work Education Programs. Systems Development Corporation, October 1973.

Cost Effectiveness of Selected Cooperative Vocational Education Programs as Compared with Vocational Programs without Cooperative Component. Battelle Columbus Laboratories, June 1973.

Annual State Vocational Education Reports

State Advisory Committee Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education - Work Study Programs

Legislation:

VEA of 1963, as amended 1968, Part H
extended by P.L. 91-230 and P.L. 92-318

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965	$30,000,000	$ 5,000,000
	1966	50,000,000	25,000,000
	1967	35,000,000	10,000,000
	1968	35,000,000	10,000,000
	1969	35,000,000	-0-
	1970	35,000,000	4,250,000
	1971	45,000,000	5,500,000
	1972	55,000,000	6,000,000
	1973	55,000,000	6,000,000
	1974	55,000,000	7,849,000
	1975	55,000,000	7,849,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Formula grants are allocated to the States for work-study programs to assist economically disadvantaged full-time vocational educational students, ages 15-20, to remain in school. The programs provide part-time employment with public employers. Priority is given to areas having high dropout rates and high youth unemployment. Funds are used for the administration of the program and for compensation to students by the local educational agencies or other public agencies or institutions. Funds are allocated on a matching basis -- 80 percent Federal and 20 percent State and local.

Work-study is essentially an income maintenance program for economically deprived youth who are in school. Only about two percent of the Federal funds is used for administration; nearly all funds, about 98 percent, go directly to needy students in the form of wages for a public service job.

The work-study program is in line with the career education objective of preparing every individual with a marketable skill, or for further education. Students provided financial assistance are the economically disadvantaged who are apt to drop out of school before obtaining sufficient job skills for economic dependence.

Program Scope:

Vocational work-study was first authorized in the Vocational Education Act of 1963. The cumulative enrollment since then has been nearly 280,000 students. Some 30,896 secondary and postsecondary students were served in fiscal year 1972; in 1973, the number increased to 33,681; of these, 26,665 were secondary and 7,016 were postsecondary.

Most of the recipients are secondary students. Since compensation cannot exceed $45 a month, most postsecondary students must look elsewhere for the financial support they need. Typical positions held by work-study students included: food service worker, clerk typist, hospital aide, printing assistance, drafting assistant, furniture repairman, and appliance repairman.

Program Effectiveness:

Work-study programs appear to be meeting their basic objective, which is to keep students in school by providing them with financial assistance, according to the "Assessment of School-Supervised Work Education" study completed in the fall of 1973. (The study is further described in the section relating to Cooperative Education Programs.)

The report indicates that, while many work-study programs have additional goals such as improving the disadvantaged youngster's attitudes toward school and work, very little attempt is made to offer students related classwork or intensive vocational training. Students are placed primarily in unskilled blue collar and clerical jobs. Only six percent of the cooperative education students were in the lowest category of job responsibility scale whereas 75 percent of the work-study education students were in this category.

Analysis of pay factors indicate that students in work-study programs are more likely than students in any other type of program to earn at best the minimum wage. Work-study students work primarily for money, as compared with cooperative education students who indicated that getting occupational training experience was more important than pay.

Ongoing or Planned Evaluation Studies:

A follow-up of the participating and the comparison group interviewed in the first phase of the "School-Supervised Work Education Study" is now in progress. The follow-up of the original sample study will provide information about what happens to work study students after they graduate. Data should indicate whether they completed their training, learned a skill which they could use after graduation, and whether students in work-study programs fared better than the comparison groups.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Assessment of School-Supervised Work Education Programs. Systems Development Corporation, September 1973.

Annual State Reports

State Advisory Committee Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education -- Curriculum Development

Legislation:

VEA of 1963, as amended, Part I

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1969	$ 7,000,000	-0-
	1970	10,000,000	$ 880,000
	1971	10,000,000	4,000,000
	1972	10,000,000	4,000,000
	1973	10,000,000	4,000,000
	1974	10,000,000	4,000,000
	1975	10,000,000	1,000,000

Program Purpose and Objectives:

Part I of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended, authorizes the Commissioner to make grants to or contracts with colleges and universities, State boards, and other public or nonprofit private agencies and institutions for curriculum development in vocational and technical education. No matching funds are required.

The Curriculum Development Program provides for the development, testing, and dissemination of vocational education curriculum materials for use in teaching occupational subjects, including those covering new and changing occupational fields. Curriculum materials are also provided for vocational teacher education. The program further provides for: developing standards for curriculum development in all occupational fields; coordinating the efforts of the States with respect to curriculum development and management; surveying curriculum materials produced by other agencies; evaluating vocational-technical education curriculum materials; and training personnel in curriculum development.

Most of these activities are carried out through individual projects. However, there are also seven curriculum centers throughout the country which provide a network for national coordination.

Program Scope:

Nineteen curriculum projects were funded in FY '70, 20 projects in FY '71, 33 in FY '72, and 26 in FY '73. Since almost all projects are full-funded, these figures generally represent new starts.

The FY '74 budget allotted $4,000,000 (plus $2 million of FY '73 impounded funds which were released) for vocational education curriculum development of which $5,920,670 was obligated for 27 projects. The projects funded fall into six major categories as follows: curriculum management centers for the coordination of curriculum efforts; occupational cluster development, evaluation, and testing; specialized vocational-technical education curriculum development; training of curriculum personnel in development and use; bases for curriculum development; and dissemination and utilization of vocational-technical education curriculum materials.

In the first-mentioned category, curriculum management centers for the coordination of curriculum efforts category, the five original centers were augmented for an additional year for a total of $200,000. The centers in the northwest and eastern part of the United States continued their operation under previous finding. Thus seven centers served all of the States.

The second category, that of occupational clusters development, evaluation, and testing, involved 13 projects in the amount of $3,183,000. New efforts were started in the arts and humanities, marine occupations, hospitality and recreation, personal services, and consumer and homemaking cluster areas. Additional cluster development was continued in the agri-business, business and office, health, and public service clusters. Two projects centered on a combination of clusters directed at Indian youth and Spanish-speaking migrants.

The third category, specialized vocational-technical education curriculum development, included a continuation of the laser and electro-optical technology, and three new projects: a model paralegal education curriculum, placement services training, and the development and utilization of metric education instructional materials. These three projects were in the amount of $1,112,684.

The fourth category involved two projects in the amount of $886,228 for the training of personnel. These projects involved development of curricula for training vocational education curriculum specialists.

In the fifth category two projects were funded which involved the bases for curriculum development in the amount of $153,211. One project was a feasibility study involving the development of a curriculum design, and a concept paper on the home as a learning center for career and family life education. The other project involved the status and progress of career education.

The last category, that of dissemination and utlization of vocational-technical education, involved one project in the amount of $385,217 for the development of films on career education systems using the characters from the Peanuts comic strip.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Source of Evaluation Data:

Program Reports of Project Directors
Site Visit Reports by OE Program Staff
Reports and Newsletters from Curriculum Network Centers
Staff Evaluation

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Adult Education -- Grants to States

Legislation:

Adult Education Act of 1966
(P.L. 91-230, Title III)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973
(Extended)

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	Under Econ. Opp. Act	$ 18,612,000
1966	" " " "	19,689,063
1967	$ 40,000,000	26,280,000
1968	60,000,000	32,200,000
1969	70,000,000	36,000,000
1970	160,000,000	40,000,000
1971	200,000,000	44,875,000
1972	225,000,000	51,134,000
1973	225,000,000	51,300,000
1974	150,000,000*	53,485,000
1975	150,000,000	63,319,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program is operated through formula grants made to States for the education of adults. The program is directed toward adults who are 16 years of age or older and who have not achieved the 12th-grade level of education. The purpose is to enable them to become more employable, productive, and responsible citizens.

Local school districts submit plans and proposals to the State education agency which makes the funding decisions. Ten percent of the total cost of any program must be covered by the State and/or local education agency, with up to 90 percent covered by Federal funds allocated to the State. The average State matching in Fiscal 1974 was approximately 23 percent.

Special emphasis is given to providing basic education classes for those adults with less than an 8th-grade education. The law states that such basic education programs must be provided first, and that additional programs may be offered only when these needs can be shown to have been met. States which have met the need for adult basic education in a particular school district or geographic area may then expend up to 20 percent of their Federal-State grant for adult secondary education programs leading to a high-school equivalency degree.

---

*Under P.L. 93-380 dated August 21, 1974.

Among those eligible to be served are the aprroximately 750,000 public school students who drop out each year and who are therefore eligible candidates for adult secondary programs. There are also about 400,000 immigrants arriving each year, a substantial number of whom need instruction in English as a second language in order to function as citizens in the United States. In Fiscal 1974, approximately 30 percent of the participants in State Grant Programs were enrolled in English as a second language. About 9.3 percent of the enrollees were institutionalized in mental hospitals and prisons.

Program Scope:

The group at which this program is directed consists of over 51.5 million adults age 16 or over who have not completed and who are not currently enrolled in high school. Within this group special emphasis is directed toward approximately 15,000,000 adults with less than eight years of formal education.

Complete enrollment data for the Fiscal Year 1974 are not yet available. However, since a substantial amount of FY 1973 funds were carried over to FY 74, an increase in enrollment was anticipated. The estimated FY 74 enrollment is approximately 800,000 of which 55.9 percent (468,800) are female. There are 245,364 unemployed and 94,640 who are receiving public assistance. States also reported that 213,864 participants upgraded their educational level by receiving certificates of completion at the 8th-grade level, by passing the General Education Development Test, by graduating from high school, or by enrolling in some other educational program as a result of having been enrolled in an adult basic education program.

Program Effectiveness:

An evaluation of the adult basic education program was completed by the Systems Development Corporation in November 1973. This study, which began in June 1971, was the first Nationwide effort at evaluating the program. The study focused on examining the effects of the ABE program on the priority group -- adults from 18 to 44 years of age with less than 8 years of schooling. The sample included 2,300 students representing 200 classes, 90 programs, and 15 States. This national sample represented the 280,000 students enrolled in ABE programs in FY 70 who fell within the defined population. Students were tested twice and interviewed three times.

Additional information was collected and findings are available which describe the ABE programs and classes, the characteristics of the students, gains in reading and math, class and student cost data, and State and local approaches to establishing new classes and use of innovations. Among the highlights in the findings are the following:

1. An average local program provided about 43 classes per year, each serving approximately 16 students. Local administrators estimated that the mean annual expenditure from all sources was about $4,000 per class per year, or an average of about $250 per training slot which may serve

three or more students per year. (However, State reports indicate that the average Federal cost is approximately $70 per student.)

2. Most classes meet in school buildings two evenings per week from September through May. The average session was about three hours. Instruction was offered at many different levels in any given class. Frequently a single class would involve all grade levels from 1 through 8. The class was usually taught by a certificated teacher with more than two years of experience in teaching adults. Almost all teachers had also received some special training for adult teaching but taught adults only part-time.

3. Most classes emphasized reading and mathematics, but the basic instruction covered skills for job improvement, writing, preparation for high school studies, and "life skills" such as citizenship responsibilities and consumer education.

4. Although more than half of the students reported having completed nine or more years in school, their average scores on initial tests showed achievement at the 5th grade level in reading and at the 6th grade level in mathematics. A second test showed that, in a period of 16 weeks, the average student gained six months in reading and from 3 to 4 months in mathematics. About one fourth of the students tested gained a full grade or more in reading in the 16-week period, and one fifth gained a grade or more in mathematics.

Public Law 93-380, dated August 21, 1974, makes several changes in OE's Adult Education programs. Among those relevant to the State-Grant Program are:

1. Authorization through FY 1978.

2. Authorization for programs of adult secondary education limiting the maximum expenditure to not more than 20% of the State's allotment.

3. Provision requiring cooperation with manpower development and training programs and occupational education programs, and for coordination of programs...including reading improvement programs.

4. Requirement that programs for institutionalized persons be included, limiting the maximum expenditure of funds to 20% for this purpose.

5. Provision for bilingual education programs for adults of limited English-speaking ability.

6. Authorization for State Advisory Councils.

7. A definition of a Community Education Program through which public school buildings may be used to provide educational, cultural, recreational and other related community services.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Annual State Program Reports

Annual State Financial Reports

Regional Office Reports on Selected Merit Award Programs

Regional Office Reports on Site-Visits to Programs and State Departments

HEW Reports on State Funds Audits

Longitudinal Evaluation of the Adult Basic Education Program, System Development Corporation (Final Report TM-WD-5743), November 1973.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Adult Education -- Special Projects

Legislation:

Adult Education Act of 1966
(P.L. 91-230, Title III, Section 309(b)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1973

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	Under Econ. Opp. Act	
	1967	Under P.L. 89-750*	$ 1,520,162
	1968	" " "	6,550,000
	1969	" " "	7,000,000
	1970	Under P.L. 91-230*	7,900,000
	1971	" " "	6,639,984
	1972	" " "	6,992,563
	1973	" " "	7,000,000
	1974	" " "	7,000,000
	1975	Under P.L. 93-380	-0-

Program Purpose and Operation:

Project grants were awarded to State or local educational agencies or other public or private nonprofit agencies, including Educational Television stations, for the purpose of experimenting with and developing improvements in adult education. The Projects supported involve (1) the use of innovative methods, systems, materials, or programs which may have national significance or be of special value in promoting effective programs in adult education, or (2) the support of programs carried out in cooperation with other Federal, State, or local efforts which have unusual promise in developing a comprehensive approach to the problems of people with educational deficiencies.

Priorities were developed on an annual basis to assure that the program reflects current needs. Wherever feasible, the grant recipient is required to provide 10 percent of the cost of the project. The projects are designed to yield results which can be replicated by a local school system and are used to strengthen existing State-Grant Programs wherever possible.

---

*Both P.L. 89-750 and P.L. 91-230 include a specification for the use of not less than 10% nor more than 20% of the total AE appropriation for Special Projects and Training.

Program Scope:

The target group at which this program aims is the estimated more than 51.5 million adults age 16 or over who have not completed and who are not currently enrolled in high school. Within this group special emphasis is given to the needs of adults between ages 18 and 44 who are functioning at or below the eighth-grade level.

During the Fiscal Year 1974 there were 47 grants for Special Projects. These included 16 new awards and 31 grant renewals for projects begun in previous years.

The major priorities for funding during FY 74 were as follows:

Adult career education.

Adult reading efforts in cooperation with the Right-to-Read Program.

Improvement of State-administered adult education services.

Renewal of promising, on-going projects.

Program Effectiveness:

To date information about the effectiveness of the Special Projects program has been obtained primarily by site visits under the Program Assistance Review Team System (PART). Under this procedure the OE Project Monitor, the Regional Adult Education Officer, and the State Director of Adult Education form a team to make the site visit. After it is concluded, each writes an independent report of his observations and recommendations.

In addition, wherever it is feasible and/or appropriate, the Special Project includes provisions for an independent, third-party evaluation. The determination of feasibility is made by the initiator and the OE Project Monitor according to pertinent regulations before the grant is made final.

Public Law 93-380 eliminated the discretionary funds used for the Special Projects Program at the Federal level as of the end of FY 74. It specifies instead that each State must spend not less than 15% of its allocation on special projects and teacher training.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

In the Spring of 1974 an RFP was prepared for a study concerned with "Research and Evaluation on Adult Education and the Special Projects Program." A contract was awarded to Kirschner Associates, Inc. in June 1974. As a result of the deletion of the Special Projects Program, the requirement for funding such projects at the State level, and the addition of the Clearinghouse in AE by P.L. 93-380, that contract has been amended. It now focuses on: (1) defining the sub-groups within the adult population in terms of both needs and demands, (2) examining other Federal AE programs and the State and local structures through which Federal funds are expended to meet these needs and demands, (3) examining the concept of Special Projects and Training Programs as a means of meeting needs at both the Federal and State levels, (4) exploring possible roles for the new AE Clearinghouse, and (5) developing a wide range of alternative goals, objectives, and strategies which might be part of an appropriate foundation for Federal policy in Adult Education.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Special Projects Reports, both semi-annual and final

Program Assistance Review Team Reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Adult Education -- Teacher Training

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Adult Education Act of 1966 (P.L. 91-230, Title III, Section 309(c)	June 30, 1973 (Extended)

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	Under Econ. Opp. Act	$ 1,055,000
	1967	Under P.L. 89-750*	1,399,838
	1968	" " "	1,500,000
	1969	" " "	2,000,000
	1970	Under P.L. 91-230*	2,000,000
	1971	" " "	3,360,016
	1972	" " "	3,007,437
	1973	" " "	3,000,000
	1974	" " "	3,000,000
	1975	Under P.L. 93-380	-0-

Program Purpose and Operation:

Project grants were awarded to institutions of higher education, State or local educational agencies, or other public or private nonprofit agencies to promote and coordinate the training of personnel who work or are preparing to work in adult education. A primary purpose was to develop resources for increasing the scope and effectiveness of adult education under the State Grant Program. In addition to teachers, training was provided for administrators, counselors, and paraprofessionals. The Training Projects have also been used to emphasize coordination among educational institutions, to sensitize adult education personnel to the unique needs of educationally disadvantaged adults, and to develop and implement new instructional materials and techniques.

A major redirection in the training of personnel for adult education programs took place in Fiscal 1972 with a shift of emphasis from summer workshop programs to the regional planning and coordination of staff development activities.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

Fiscal 1974 was the third and final year of funding the regionally-based staff development efforts. There are nine projects directed toward regional adult education personnel needs. The projects will continue through FY 75 on the basis of forward funding, after which they may be sustained by State and institutional funds. (During FY'74 approximately 23,500 people participated in these training programs, supported by about $2.2 million.)

---

*Both P.L. 89-750 and P.L. 91-230 include a specification for the use of not less than 10% nor more than 20% of the total AE appropriation for Special Projects and Training.

The remaining Fiscal 1974 teacher training funds available (approximately $800,000) are supporting nine additional projects which provide for resource development, correctional personnel training, Indian educational leadership development, instructional content improvement, and studies in cultural and ethnic understanding.

One measure of the effectiveness of these training programs for adult education personnel will be the extent to which they are supported by State and local resources after Federal support is terminated. At present all States are using some portion of their State grant funds to support training activities, although the amounts vary. Universities, colleges, and other agencies are also providing supplementary training support in some States. These funds are in addition to those provided for Federally-supported training projects.

Public Law 93-380 eliminated the use of discretionary funds at the Federal level for personnel training. However, this new law specifies that each State must use not less than 15% of its allocation on training and special projects.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Semi-annual and Annual Project Reports

Written reports of site visits by OE staff

Written reports of site visits, made at least twice each year, by the Regional Program Officer for Adult Education.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA)

Legislation:

Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1974

FUNDING HISTORY:

(Appropriations for MDTA)
(are made to the Department)
(of Labor. Funds are transferred)
(to DHEW for institutional)
(training.)

Total Federal obligations for institutional training including allowances paid trainee:

1965	$249,348,000
1966	281,710,000
1967	215,588,000
1968	221,847,000
1969	213,505,000
1970	256,071,000
1971	276,767,000
1972	355,407,000
1973	303,814,000
1974	307,896,069
1975	-0- *

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Labor jointly administer programs authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act. These programs are aimed at reducing the level of unemployment, offsetting skill shortages, and enhancing the skills and productivity of the Nation's work force. The major tool used is education and training of those who are out of a job or are working at less than their full potential.

Under the Act, the secretary of Labor must assess the need for training, select the trainees, provide allowances and other training benefits, and help trainees get jobs. He is also responsible for job-development programs and experimental and demonstration projects, and for working with employers to develop on-the job training (OJT).

* The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act now supercedes MDTA.

Institutional training coupled with OJT projects are a further responsibility of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as is institutional training, offered to residents of redevelopment areas, and the communities which are severely depressed economically. The Secretary is also responsible for instructional aspects of experimental and demonstration projects, as well as MDTA training in correctional institutions.

Most training programs are operated through State agreements. Training is provided through public educational agencies or private institutions. The State Agency is paid not more than 90% of the cost to the State for carrying out the agreement.

Program Scope:

Since the beginning of the MDTA program in August of 1962, 1,504,600 persons have been enrolled in the institutional training program, 68 percent completed their training objective and 50 percent of those completing secured employment. Part of the remaining 50 percent were called into the armed forces, some returned to school full-time, and others withdrew from the labor force.

In fiscal year 1974, 83,300 trainees completed institutional training and 65,100 had secured employment and were still on the job when last contacted.

First time enrollments:	1963	32,000
	1964	68,600
	1965	145,300
	1966	177,500
	1967	150,000
	1968	140,000
	1969	135,000
	1970	130,000
	1971	155,600
	1972	150,600
	1973	119,600
	1974	110,400

Training has been conducted in over 300 different occupational skill areas, ranging from accounting clerk to x-ray technician. Clerical occupations attract the largest group, almost 20 percent of the total enrollments.

Program Effectiveness:

The MDTA institutional training program appeared to be generally effective in providing training and services to unemployed and underemployed adults, according to national data and a series of evaluation studies jointly developed and administered by the U.S. Office of Education and the Department of Labor.

MDTA Basic Education Study:

The study of 17 Training Centers found that MDTA Basic Education Trainees made a statistically significant gain in reading and computational ability. The average trainee entering at about the 7th grade level (after reaching the 10th grade in school) emerges in 6 months at the 8th grade level, and with an occupational skill. He, or she, is much more adept at fractions and decimals, can operate a micrometer, or can now calculate interest rates for time payment plans. He or she can read faster, reads a wider variety of materials, and has increased his or her vocabulary beyond purely technical terms. Classroom situations have improved communication skills and self confidence.

Black trainees appear to have reading problems that are not adequately corrected in training, but they do well in Math. Spanish-surnamed trainees also suffer from a reading disadvantaged, but make good gains in reading, nonetheless.

The training center staff and instructors are well qualified in the traditional sense, and resourceful in adapting materials and techniques to the MDTA training situation. However, technical training in individualized instruction, diagnostic procedures, and in planning and monitoring goal achievement would be helpful.

An immediate improvement would be the development of effective scheduling procedures i.e., balancing individualized instruction concurrently with occupational training. Improved training in individualized instruction and better facilities and materials would help too. However, the use of techniques and materials must be integrated into an overall program for the trainee. Training centers having the most influence on trainee gains were those where management, coordination, and cooperation were outstanding.

The Evaluation of the Availability and Effectiveness of MDTA Institutional Training and Employment Services for Women:

The study was divided into two phases. Phase I had two major tasks: (1) a literature search and (2) a re-analysis of data from the MDTA Outcome Study. Phase II was an exploratory data collection effort to assess factors which appear to affect the performance of women during institutional training in 12 sites. About 200 skills center staff and employment service personnel were interviewed. Questionnaires were administered to a sample of 961 students attending classes at the time of the field review, and data was collected from records of a sample of 1,219 previous enrollees, providing information on enrollee characteristic completion and placement rates.

Data collected from the several respondent groups at the 12 study Skills Centers point up two major findings concerning women in manpower programs:

> Female trainees are generally being trained in the same occupation as their last full-time job.

There is little enrollment of trainees in courses traditionally reserved for the opposite sex, and when such enrollment does occur, it is more likely to be a male enrolling in a female course rather than the reverse.

More than 92 percent of the female enrollees in the sample who were employed before training held jobs in health-related and clerical/sales occupations. (This closely follows patterns evident in national statistics on women in the labor force.) Of these, 93 percent are currently enrolled in these same occupational categories. This pattern also holds for former female enrollees. Fifty-six percent of those employed before training had health and clerical jobs; and 94 percent received training in these occupations.

The Re-Analysis of data from the MDTA Outcome Study, using measures such as job placement, length of training, post-training income and the completion of training, indicates that in some ways the MDTA training has been at least as successful for women as for men. These findings include:

> Females, far more likely than males, used their acquired training in post-training employment (62% of females vs. 39% of males.)
>
> Females experienced the highest incremental earnings across all training periods and occupational categories, i.e., $968 for females vs. $692 for males over an 18 month period.
>
> A significantly greater percentage of female trainees (39%) than male trainees (32%) felt that MDTA training helped them get a job.

However, there were some indications that the training program had not been as successful for women as for men. These include:

> A larger percentage of females (15%) than males (9%) were found to have reported no post-training earnings.
>
> Females showed a lower correlation than males between months in training and large salary increases.

Planned or Ongoing Studies: None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

A series of evaluation studies of the MDTA Institutional Training Program have been jointly developed and administered by the U.S. Office of Education and the Department of Labor. These include:

1) MDTA Evaluation of the Availability and Effectiveness of MDTA Institutional Training for Women. Mark Battelle Associates, April 1974.

2) MDTA Basic Education Study. North American Rockwell, April 1973.

3) Manpower Development and Training Act Outcomes Study, Decision Making Information, April 1972.

4) Effectiveness in Institutional Manpower Training in Meeting Employers Needs in Skills Shortage Occupations. Olympus Research Corporation, May 1972.

5) A Study of Individual Referrals under MDTA. Olympus Research Corporation, June 1972.

6) Evaluation of Manpower Development and Training Skills Centers. Olympus Research Corporation, February 1971.

7) Evaluation of the Relevance and Quality of Preparation under the MDTA Institutional Training Program. Mentec Corporation, May 1971.

8) An Analysis and Evaluation of MDTA Institutional Programs Systems and Practices. North American Rockwell Information Systems Company, April 1971.

D. HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Basic Educational Opportunity Grant Program

Legislation:

Education Amendments of 1972, Title I;
Public Law 92-318, 86 Stat., 248-25[illegible]

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Auth[illegible]	Appropriation
	1973	(Such s[illegible]	$122,100,000
	1974	may be necessary	475,000,000
	1975	"	660,000,000*

*Estimate

Program Purpose and Operations:

This program is designed to help qualified students finance their postsecondary education. The program applies to half-time as well as to full-time students, and to postsecondary vocational, technical, and proprietary institutions as well as to colleges. The grants are not available for graduate study but may extend to five years of undergraduate work under special circumstances specified by the Act. At full funding, the program provides a grant of $1400 less expected family contribution, but not to exceed one-half of the cost of attendance. The law provides a reduction formula for less than full funding.

The law requires a schedule of expected family contribution to be submitted to Congress. The schedule limits payments and specifies how grants are to be adjusted when appropriations require less than full funding.

Program Scope

Application data for FY 1973-4 and 1974-5 indicate that 482,331 valid applications were received in FY 1973-4 and of the 268,444 (about 56%) qualified for aid under the BEOG program. The 1974-5 application rate is expected to be almost triple that of 1973-4. As of March 4, 1975, over 1.3 million applications had been received, 1,057,100 of which were valid. Of the latter, 641,200 (60.7%) qualified for aid. The deadline for receipt of applications is March 15, 1975.

Program Effectiveness

Since the 1973-74 academic year was the first year of program operation, there is only general information on which to judge its impact. The principle data available is application data which provides a rough idea of the thrust of the program with respect to the national goal of student access.

With respect to sex and income classifications, application data for 1973-4 indicates that the apparent impact of the program is in the direction of greater equality of access to postsecondary education. Of the applicants who qualified for aid in 1973-4, 56.1 percent were female and 43.9 percent were male. These percentages were almost exactly opposite to the proportions of females and males enrolled in institutions of higher education in the fall of 1973 which were 43.1 and 56.9 percent respectively.

The percentage distribution by income class of qualified applicants indicates that the program is working in the direction of equality of access by this dimension as well. The table below presents this distribution for dependent, independent, and total numbers of qualified applicants for 1973-4. These data indicate that over half of the total number of qualified applicants have incomes below $6,000 and of those who are classified as independents over 90 percent have incomes less than $6,000. The percentages reflected in the incomplete returns available for 1974-75 do not differ markedly from the above.

Percentage Distributions by Income Class of
Applicants Qualifying for BEOG Awards
1973-74

Income	Dependent	Independent	Total
0-2,999	19.7	64.2	25.5
3,000-5,999	25.2	26.5	25.3
6,000-8,999	26.1	8.4	23.7
9,000-11,999	20.4	0.8	17.8
12,000-14,999	7.1	*	6.2
15,000	1.6	*	1.4
	100.0	100.0	100.0

* Less than 0.05

The above data must be interpreted with caution because it is not known if these sex and income distributions of qualifying applicants are representative of the distribution of eligibles who actually exercised their BEOG options.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Office of Education is currently engaged in feasibility and design efforts directed towards the preparation of a new study which will attempt to assess the impact of all OE-sponsored student assistance programs.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Program files, Division of Basic and State Student Grants, Bureau of Postsecondary Education.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Public Law 92-318, 86 Stat. 251	June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1974	$200,000,000*	$210,300,000
	1975	200,000,000*	240,300,000

*For initial year grants plus such sums as may be needed for continuing grants.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG) funds for initial year awards are apportioned among the states in the same ratio as a state's full-time and full-time equivalent enrollment may bear to the total national full-time and full-time equivalent enrollment. Continuing awards are alloted in accordance with regulations published by the Commissioner of Education. Grants which are awarded by institutions of higher education are designed to provide additional resources to students whose finances are otherwise insufficient to permit attendance without such a grant. The maximum award is $1,500 per year or one-half of the sum of the total amount of student financial aid provided to such student by the institution -- whichever is the lesser. The total amount of funds awarded to any student, over the course of his academic career, may not exceed $4,000 -- except in those instances where a student is enrolled in a program of study extending over five academic years, or where particular circumstances, as determined by the institution, require that a student spend an additional year completing a program of study which normally requires four academic years. The limit is then set at $5,000. Awards are limited to students who have been accepted as undergraduates at their respective institutions, who maintain satisfactory progress, who are enrolled at least half time, and who would be financially unable to pursue a program of study at such institution without such an award.

Program Scope:

In 1973-4, 2904 institutions participated in the SEOG program. This represented a 26.1 percent increase over institutional participation in the SEOG programs of 1972-3. There was a further increase of 12.2 percent in institutional participation in the SEOG program between 1973-4 and 1974-75 with 3258 institutions participating in the latter fiscal year. During these years, the largest percentage increase was in the private sector, with institutional participation increasing by over 75 percent to 843 proprietary schools. An additional 1284 private schools applied to participate in SEOG. In fiscal years 1974-75 public universities received 38.0% of the funds, other public four-year institutions received 7.5%; public two-year colleges, 13.9%; public vocational-technical schools, 1.1%; private universities, 12.6%; other four-year private institutions, 17.6%; private two-year school, 2.7%; and proprietary schools, 6.6%. This percentage distribution for 1974-75 does not substantially differ from fiscal year 1973-74. Estimated program data indicate that in both years approximately 300,000 students received average grants of $670.

The increase in institutional requests over the past two years indicates that there is a large institutional demand for SEOG funds. In fiscal year 1972 there were recommended institutional requests for EOG aid of 296,000,000. By 1973-74 requests had increased to $554,916,952 and in 1974-75 to $572,906,527 while appropriations remained at less than half of those figures.

Program Effectiveness:

While data with which to judge the effectiveness of the SEOG program in the achievement of national goals is not yeat available, some indication can be gleaned from the socio-economic impact of the prior EOG program. Of the students who received grants under this program, it has been estimated that 33.0 had family incomes of less than $3,000; 40.0% were in the income range $3,000-5,999; 15.2% had incomes of $6,000 to 7,499; 9.3% were in the $7,500-8,999 category; and 2.3% had family incomes of $9,000 or more. This distribution, which includes both dependent and independent students, indicates that the thrust of the EOG program was clearly in the direction of greater eqaulity of access to education in terms of the income dimension. The distribution of EOG recipients by race also is indicative of a thrust toward equal access. For example, 33.5% of the grant recipients were Black, .9% were American Indian, 1.1% were Oriental American, and 8.3% were Spanish Surnames.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Office of Education is currently engaged in feasibility- and design efforts directed towards the preparation of a new study which will attempt to assess the impact of all OE-sponsored student assistance programs.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

The Federal Educational Opportunity Grant Program: A Status Report, Fiscal Year 1970, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, New York, 1971.

U.S. Department of the Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Higher Education Factbook.

Program files, Division of Basic Grants, Division of Postsecondary Education.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

State Student Incentive Grant Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Title IV, Subpart A-3 of the Higher Education Act	June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1973	$ 50,000,000*	None
	1974	50,000,000*	$ 19,000,000
	1975	50,000,000*	20,000,000

* Plus such sums as may be needed for continuation grants.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The SSIG program is designed to encourage states to develop or expand programs of grant aid to students in "substantial financial need" attending eligible institutions of postsecondary education. States are responsible for the selection of grant recipients . However, selection criteria is subject to review by the Commissioner. Individual student grants are limited to $1,500 per academic year.

SSIGP is a 50-50 cost-sharing (State-Federal) program under which Federal funds are allotted/reallotted to the states based on a formula reflecting current student attendance patterns. Reallottment is permitted if a state does not use its current allottment. Disbursements are made directly from the Federal Government to the states and from the states to postsecondary institutions on behalf of students. Since there is no prescribed aid allocation procedure, a state may employ any distribution procedure that falls within the overall scope of the statute.

States are required to administer the funds through a single state to maintain effort, new initial grants under SSIGP must be in excess of the amounts provided by the state two fiscal years prior to the year the state initially receives aid under the SSIG program.

Program Scope:

Fifty-six States and territories are potentially eligible for matching grants under the SSIG program. In FY 1974, the first year of operation, 50 states and territories qualified for grants on the basis of 27 expanded programs and 23 newly developed programs. It is expected that by FY 1976 all 56 states and territories will participate.

Under the definition of "substantial financial need" states have a wide latitude in their selection of grant recipients. Students from both low and middle incomes may receive grants under this definition. In FY 1975, 76,000 students received average initial grants of $500 ($250 Federal funds) and in FY 1976 it is estimated that 16,000 students will receive $500 average initial grants while 60,000 will receive continuation grants of the same average amount. The latter figures assume a 20 percent dropout rate for students receiving initial awards.

Program Effectiveness:

According to the latest annual survey by Joseph D. Boyd, Executive Director of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission, State aid to students has risen dramatically in 1974-75 compared 1973-4. While State aid to students has risen rapidly in the past several years, the recent increase was the largest in history. Not only has there been an increase in monies appropriated by states (with an increase in numbers of students aided), but also, the average size of awards has risen, indicating that states are making some attempt to keep up with the rate of inflation. According to Boyd, the SSIG program contributed greatly to this growth factor, especially so in encouraging those states not having programs a year ago to develop them.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Office of Education is currently engaged in feasibility and design efforts directed toward the preparation of a new study that will attempt to assess the impact of all OE-sponsored student assistance programs. A particular effort will be made in these studies to determine the effect of Federal student assistance funds on the student aid efforts of the States.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

The Chronicle of Higher Education, November 18, 1974, Vol. IX, No. 9.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

College Work-Study Program

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Public Law 89-329, Title IV, 79 Stat. 1249; as amended by Public Law 90-575 Title I, 82 Stat. 1028-1029.	June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation*
	1965	1/	$ 55,710,000
	1966	$129,000,000	99,123,000
	1967	165,000,000	134,100,000
	1968	200,000,000	139,900,000
	1969	225,000,000	139,900,000
	1970	275,000,000	152,460,000
	1971	320,000,000	158,400,000 2/
	1972	330,000,000	426,600,000 3/
	1973	360,000,000	270,200,000
	1974	390,000,000	270,200,000
	1975	420,000,000	300,200,000

* Up until FY 1972, the CWS Fiscal Year appropriation was used to fund program operations during the calendar year. With FY 1972, the program became one full year forward-funded.

1/ The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorized a lump sum of $412,500,000 for three youth programs including College Work-Study.

2/ Actual funds available for CWS in this year amounted to $199,700,000, including reprogrammed funds.

3/ Includes $244,600,000 forward funding for FY 1973, plus a supplemental of $25,600,000. A total of $237,400,000 was available for use during FY 1972 from a combination of FY 1971 and FY 1972 appropriations.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The main object of the College Work-Study program (CWS) is to promote the part-time employment of students. Employment may be made available only to those students who need additional funds to pursue a course of study at an eligible college or university. Employment may be for the institution itself (except in the case of a proprietary institution of higher education), or for a public or private non-profit organization. Students may work up to forty hours per week.

Grants are made to higher education institutions for partial reimbursement of wages paid to students. Since August 1968, these Federal grants have covered 80 percent of the student wages, with the remainder paid by the institution, the employer, or some other donor.

Two percent of each year's appropriation is reserved for Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. A portion is also reserved for students from American Samoa/Trust Territories who attend eligible institutions of postsecondary education outside Samoa or the Trust Territory. The rest is allotted among the 50 states and the District of Columbia, 51 areas by formula. The formula is based on three factors:

(1) The number of full-time higher education students each area has relative to the total number for the 51 areas.

(2) The number of high school graduates each area has relative to the total number for the 51.

(3) The number of related children under 18 years of age living in families with income of less than $3,000 each area has relative to the total number for 51.

Office of Education strategy is to provide CWS funds as an additional source of supplemental financial assistance to needy students. Need is determined by application of a needs analysis in which other sources of income and financial aid are taken into account.

Program Scope:

During Academic Year 1974-75, 3,154 institutions of postsecondary education participated in the CWS program enabling approximately 560,000 students to find part-time employment. The average annual student earnings including the institutional matching share, amounts to an estimated $580 per student.

It is estimated by the CWSP staff that, during Academic Year 1973-74, CWSP funds were distributed to institutions as follows: public universities, 39%; other four-year public, 8%; public two-year, 18%; private universities, 12%; other four-year private, 15%; private two-year, 3%; public vocational, 2%, and proprietary, 3%. Ninety four percent of the funds went to undergraduates while 6% was awarded to students at the post-baccalaureate level.

For FY 1975, panels approved $525,802,490 in institutional requests, as compared with $270,700,000 actually available for distribution to schools.

Program Effectiveness:

Last year's annual report to Congress summarized preliminary findings from the study of the CWS Program conducted by the Bureau of Applied Social

Research at Columbia University.[1] It was based on data from 1969-70 academic year. It remains the most detailed study to date on the CWS Program although some of its findings have become outdated.

The major finding of the study was that the CWS Program is achieving its primary goal of helping needy students meet the cost of postsecondary education. A special analysis of the data in the study reported on CWS aid recipients by income level who would not have attended college without work-study assistance.

Family Income Level	Percent of CWS Students Who Would Not Have Attended Without CWS
Less than $3,000	32.7%
$3,000 to $5,999	23.3
$6,000 to $7,499	16.2
$7,500 to $8,999	13.1
$9,000 or more	8.0

It can be seen that CWS aid was crucial to a larger percentage of low income students than higher income students.

The study also indicated that more than half the students receiving CWS funds were from families with incomes below $6,000 and earnings from their jobs financed approximately 54 percent of their expenses at public institutions and 27 percent of expenses at private ones. Finally, about 88 percent of the students in the study were reasonably satisfied with their jobs--though many would have preferred more career-related jobs. At the time the study was conducted, only one in four Work-Study stations could be considered career- or course-related.

In the academic year 1972-73, about 72.2% of the program participants were from families with incomes below $7,500. A larger percentage of CWS aid recipients had incomes above $7,500 for two reasons:

(1) with inflation, average family incomes had increased, and

(2) the Basic Grant program focussed its aid upon low-income students, thereby reducing somewhat their need for Work-Study and freeing up some CWS funds for somewhat higher income students.

More recently (Fall 1973), the American Council on Education conducted a survey of participating institutions asking how they expected CWSP to be distributed in Academic 1973-74 by income group. They reported that about two-thirds of the funds would go to students whose family income is less than $7,500; 30% to students from families with income between $7,500 and $14,999; and the remaining 4%, to students from families above $15,000 in income. All but 6% of this amount will go to undergraduate students.

---

[1] Bureau of Applied Social Research, The Federal College Work-Study Program: A State Report, Fiscal Year 1971. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1973.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation is completing a design study which will enable it to assess the impact of all OE-sponsoned student assistance programs.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Applied Social Research, The Federal College Work-Study Program: A State Report, Fiscal Year 1971. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1973.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Higher Education. Factbook 1973. Washington, D. C.: 1973.

The American Council on Education, The Input of Office of Education Student Assistance Programs, Fall 1973, Washington, D. C., 1974.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Cooperative Education Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-575, Title I, 82 Stat. 1030, (20 U.S.C. 1087b) included in the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended, Title IV, Part D.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1970	*	$ 1,540,000
1971	*	1,600,000
1972	$ 10,750,000	1,700,000
1973	10,750,000	10,750,000
1974	10,750,000	10,750,000
1975	10,750,000	10,750,000

* One percent of the College Work-Study appropriation was authorized to be used in support of cooperative education programs at higher education institutions.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Under this program, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to award grants for the planning, establishment, expansion or carrying out of cooperative education programs in higher education institutions. In addition, grants or contracts are authorized for the training of persons in the planning, establishment, administration, and coordination of such programs and research into methods of improving, developing, or promoting cooperative education programs in institutions of higher education. The legislation defines cooperative education as alternate periods of full-time study and full-time public or private employment related to a student's academic course of study (or his career objectives).

Under the Cooperative Education program, grants are awarded to institutions on a proposal basis, with an institution eligible to receive grants for three years. Awards cannot exceed $75,000 and funds must not be used as compensation for student employment. Salaries and other administrative expenses for cooperative education administrators are payable from grant funds.

The objective of the cooperative education program is to increase the number of opportunities for students at institutions to obtain both an education and worthwhile work experience which helps finance their education. Federal support for such programs at colleges and universities is designed to encourage institutions which do not have such programs to determine the feasibility of establishing them. Other institutions which have planned for such programs and desire to implement them may use grant funds for this purpose, and those which plan to expand or strengthen existing programs may receive support.

As far as possible, the student's work experience should correlate with and enrich his on-campus experiences. Students are paid according to their productivity and the extent to which they are capable of assuming job responsibilities. In many instances this compensation is a major source of a student's support in continuing and completing his academic program. The institutions of higher education assume the responsibility for assigning the student to a job relevant to his academic program and providing supervision during the work period. In addition, the student's job performance is evaluated by the institution. In many cases academic credit is given for the work experience, and in other cases the kind and extent of work experience is recorded on the transcript.

Program Scope:

In FY 1973 the program was funded for the first time at the authorized level of $10,750,000 -- an increase of 632 percent over the 1972 level of $1,700,000. To some degree this expansion in funding reflects the administration's interest in career education.

The FY 1974 appropriation was also at the fully authorized level of $10,750,000 with $750,00 of that sum reserved for training and research grants.

This program received its first Federal program awards in FY 1970, and although the total funding of the program to date has amounted to only $26,340,000, a majority of the established or planned cooperative education programs, numbering in excess of 759, have received Federal support.

Of the 650 proposals submitted, 371 were acted on favorably. 349 awards were made to institutions for program administration and strengthening, 17 went towards the training of cooperative education coordinators, and five towards research.

Program Effectiveness:

While no formal Federal evaluation studies have been funded, two privately funded studies have been completed which help provide an insight into certain aspects of the program. The first study, Impact of Cooperative Education on Personal Development and Growth of Values, was conducted by James Wilson of Northeastern University, and was completed July 1974. Interviews were held with 456 Northeastern University Liberal Arts undergraduate students. Two hundred ninety-three of these were cooperative education students and 163 served as a control group.

The outcome data consisted of student perceptions of change in attitude toward career expectation that occurred to them since entering college and the perceived agent of change. Cooperative education students perceived greater personal change during their undergraduate years than did the control group. While it is acknowledged that the primary agent of change for both groups was the maturation process, apparently work experience added another dimension for the cooperative education students. Specifically, cooperative education students put a higher priority on career establishment. Their social and humanistic attitudes, tempered by work experience, were more conservative and cautious.

Evaluation of another aspect of cooperative education is provided in the second study, conducted by the Arthur D. Little Company, entitled Documented Employer Benefits from Cooperative Education. This study consists of six case studies of different types of employers of cooperative education students. The findings document a number of benefits perceived by employers participating in the cooperative education program, as follows:

1. A good source of paraprofessional or preprofessional manpower

Firms which emphasized this advantage of cooperative education student employment established specific work slots for the students and found it to be a cost-effective arrangement. These students were always paid entry level salaries--whereas permanent employees would be entitled to time--in grade salary increments and fringe benefits not accorded to temporary employees.

2. Generation of released professional manpower

Firms which emphasized this employer benefit would pair a cooperative education student with one of the firms professional employees. The student under guidance of the professional would do the more routine aspects of the professional's job and free the professional to do the more demanding parts.

3. Improved Personnel Selection

Both the employer and prospective permanent employee can realistically assess each other before commitment to permanent employment.

4. Improved Relations with Colleges

Communication between employers and colleges is facilitated by cooperative education. Businesses have the opportunity to influence course offerings and to keep colleges informed of their personnel requirements.

While limited in scope, these studies point out the value of cooperative education as a meaningful work-experience activity that benefits both students and employers.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Consad Research Corporation is now conducting a modest planning study 1/ on the goals of cooperative education. Essentially, this study consists of eight case studies diverse cooperative education programs. While it will not provide extensive evaluation information on the Federal program, it is expected that the results of the study will provide useful information for policy making.

Congress has mandated an evaluation study of cooperative education as part of the HEW Appropriation Act for FY 1975. As a result a more formal and extensive evaluation of the program will be part of the FY 1975 Evaluation activities.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Factbook. Bureau of Higher Education. January 1973.
OPBE, "impact of Cooperative Education Upon Personnel Development and Growth of Values" by James Wilson. "Documented Employer Benefits from Cooperative Education" by Arthur D. Little.

1/ "A Proposed Study of Cooperation Education", - July 1974 - March 1975.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Guaranteed Student Loan Program

Legislation:

Title IV-B, Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended; Public Law 89-329, as amended; Emergency Insured Student Loan Act of 1969; Public Law 91-95 as amended.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Loan Volume	Obligations 1/	Appropriation 1/
1966	$ 77,492,002 2/	$ -	$ 11,000,000 2/
1967	249,235,000 2/	5,422,000	48,000,000 2/
1968	459,377,000 2/	21,003,000	43,600,000 2/
1969	686,676,000	48,847,000	74,900,000
1970	839,666,000	85,211,000	73,226,000
1971	1,043,991,000	145,881,000	121,000,000
1972	1,301,577,000	202,416,000	169,131,000
1973	1,198,523,000	265,749,000	258,477,000
1974	1,140,742,000	331,358,000	313,668,000
1975	1,400,000,000	580,000,000 (Est.)	580,000,000

1/ Includes: advances for reserve funds, expenditures for interest payments, death and disability claims, special allowance, bankruptcy claims and default claims. Costs for computer services and other S&E items are not included.

2/ Includes loans primarily carried under Vocational Education.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of the Program is to provide loans for students attending 3,705 eligible institutions of higher education, 4,149 vocational, technical, business and trade schools, and 619 eligible foreign institutions.

The principal of the loan is provided by participating lending institutions such as commercial banks, savings and loan association, credit unions, insurance companies, pension funds, and eligible educational institutions. The loan is guaranteed by a State or private non-profit agency or insured by the Federal government.

Loan programs are nearly equally divided between those insured by States and reinsured (80 percent) by the Federal government and those directly insured by the Federal government. A student is eligible if he is enrolled and in good standing or accepted for enrollment at least half time at an eligible institution and is a United States citizen or is in the United States for other than a temporary purpose. The total aggregate of loans outstanding cannot exceed $7,500 for undergraduate students and $10,000 for graduate students including undergraduate loans. Students may apply for Federal interest benefits by submitting to the lender a recommendation by the educational institution as to the amount needed by the student to meet his educational costs. After considering the recommendation, the lender will determine the amount of the loan. For students found eligible for interest benefits, the Federal government will pay to the lender the total interest due prior to the beginning of the repayment period. Students not eligible for Federal interest benefits may still apply for a loan but will have to pay their own interest. The student pays the total interest at an annual percentage rate of 7% during the repayment period which begins 9-12 months after graduation or withdrawal from school. Deferments are allowed for return to school as a full-time student and up to three years for military service, Peace Corps, or VISTA participation. Minimum repayment period is generally five years, the maximum being ten years. The maximum loan period is fifteen years.

A special allowance is authorized to be paid to lenders when the Secretary determines that economic conditions are impeding or threatening to impede the fulfillment of the purposes of the Program and that the return to the lender is less than equitable. The rate which is determined quarterly may not exceed 3% per annum on the average quarterly unpaid balance of principal loans outstanding on or after August 1, 1969.

Many different types of institutions participate as lenders in GSLP. By percent of total loan disbursement volume, the following types constituted the major portion of FISLP lending in FY 1974:

Type of Lending Institution	% of FY 1974 Disbursements
Proprietary Vocational Schools	33.4
National Banks	22.7
State Banks (FDIC)	23.3
Institutions of Higher Education	4.7
Direct State Loan Programs	4.4
all other types	11.5
	100.0 percent

Program Scope:

In Fiscal year 1974 over 19,000 institutions were approved for lending, and 431,000 Federal loans as well as 418,000 State and other loans totalling 849,000 were disbursed. The total amount of loan disbursements was $1,031,000,000, $520 million of which was Federal and $511 million of which was State and other. The amount of the average loan was $1,215. FISLP is operating in 28 states on a statewide basis.

Of the total FY 1974 obligations, $310 million went to interest benefits and Special Allowance payments, $3.57 for death and disability payments, and $3.24 million for bankruptcy losses, and $91.9 million for the Student Loan Insurance Fund for the payment of defaulted claims.

Program Effectiveness:

Program effectiveness can be partially measured by indicating the distribution of loans among borrowers with different characteristics. These distributions can be compared with those of other student assistance programs which are, by design, targeted to students from lower income families.

In FY 1974, 21.6 percent of SISLP borrowers (both dependent and independent students) were from families with adjusted family income less than $3,000, 24.9 percent had family incomes between $3,000 and $6,000, 19.6 percent were from families between $6,000 and $9,000 of incomes, 11.1 percent from families having $9,000-$12,000 income, 6.1 percent between $12,000 and $15,000, and 0.0 percent with adjusted gross family income over $15,000. 1/

The percent distribution of FISLP loans disburased by ethno-racial category was: 11.6 percent Black; 2.6 percent Spanish American; .5 percent Oriental American; and 77.9 percent White; and 7.2 percent not responding. Approximately 66 percent of loans are to males and 34 percent to females. 44 percent of loans go to first year students, 15 percent to second year students, 16 percent to third year students, 14 percent to fourth and fifth year students, and 11 percent to graduate students. The average age of borrowers has been increasing and 26 percent of all borrowers in FY 1973 were 27 years of age or older. Approximately 57 percent of borrowers were single.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations

A GSLP Loan Estimation Model has recently been completed by Systems Group, Inc., of Washington, D.C. The data base for the model will be updated by the Office of Guaranteed Student Loans and further special analyses of the historical data base will be undertaken during FY 1975 by System Group and others. The Survey of Lenders and Borrowers will be completed by May 1975. These separate surveys of a sample of lending institutions and of borrowers who are in repayment status are being conducted by Resource Management Corporation of Bethesda, Maryland. Preliminary analysis of selected questionnaire items will be available in January, 1975.

1/ Adjusted family income is after exemptions and standard or itemized deductions. These adjustments vary considerably between lower and higher income categories. The first two income categories ($0-3,000, $3-6,000) contain a much larger proportion of independent students than do the remaining income categories.

Source of Evaluation Data

GSLP Loan Estimation Model, Systems Group, Inc., Washington, D.C., September 1973.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

National Direct Student Loan Program

Legislation:

Title IV, Part E of the HEA 1965 Public Law 89-329, as amended.[3]

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization[1]	Appropriation[2]
1966	$179,300,000	$181,550,000
1967	190,000,000	192,000,000
1968	225,000,000	193,400,000
1969	210,000,000	193,400,000
1970	325,000,000	195,460,000
1971	375,000,000	243,000,000
1972	375,000,000	316,600,000[4]
1973	400,000,000	292,970,000[5]
1974	400,000,000	298,000,000
1975	400,000,000	329,440,000

---

[1] Authorization for contribution to loan fund lonly. In addition, a total of $25,000,000 was authorized for loans to institutions from Fiscal Year 1959 through the duration of the Act.

[2] Appropriation includes contributions to loan fund, loans to institutions and Federal payments to repay the institutional share of cancellations.

[3] Prior to FY 1973, the program was known as the National Defense Student Loan Program. Title II of NDEA of 1958 as amended (P.L. 85-864)

[4] Actual FY 72 appropriation was $316,600,000. However, 23.6 million was mandated to be used during FY 1973. The difference of $293.0 million was made available for use during FY 72 of which $286 million was for contribution to loan funds.

[5] Of this amount $269,370,000 was available for use in FY 73 and $23,600,000 was mandated for FY 74.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The objective of the Program is to fund postsecondary institutions for the purpose of making long-term, low-interest loans to students with financial need. Such loans complement other forms of student financial assistance such as Basic and Supplemental Education Opportunity Grants, College Work-Study, and Insured Student Loans.

Funding is initially alloted to States by means of a special allotment formula. Funding levels for institutions within each State are recommended by regional review panels consisting of OE Program Officers from the regional and national offices and financial aid officers selected from institutions in that region. Recommended funding levels are generally in excess of the annual NDSL allotment for a State. In such cases, the entire group of institutions within a State receives less than 100 percent of their panel approved amount. However, each institution within that group receives a pro-rated reduction in its allocation which, in percentage, is equal to that of every other institution in the State. Institutions often distribute NDS loans in conjunction with other forms of financial aid and financial aid officers "package" these various aid components in different ways depending on available funds and student circumstances. Students may borrow a total of: (2) $2,500 if they are enrolled in a vocational program or if they have completed less than two years of a program leading to a bachelor's degree; (b) $5,000 if they are undergraduate students and have already completed two years of study toward a bachelor's degree (this total includes any amount borrowed under the NDSL for the first two years of study); (c) $10,000 for graduate study (this total includes any amount borrowed under the NDSL for undergraduate study). Upon leaving the institution, students sign a repayment agreement which specifies the duration and amount of repayment. After a nine month grace period following cessation of studies, the student begins repayment (on a monthly, bimonthly, or quarterly basis) normally over a ten year period. The borrower's ten year repayment period may be deferred not to exceed three years for service with VISTA, the Peace Corps, or military service.

A percentage of the total loan amount may be cancelled for individuals providing special services in specific teaching areas and for members of the Armed Forces of the United States' survey in areas of hostility.

Program Scope:

In Fiscal Year 1973, 2,293 institutions received contributions to loan funds, while an estimated 379,000 first time recipients and 245,500 continuing recipients (a total of 624,500) received loans. The average loan per student was an estimated $690. It is estimated that 45.0% of the funds went to universities, 41.9% went to four-year institutions, and 13.1% went to two-year schools. Public institutions received an estimated 55.9% of the funds distributed while private institutions received an estimated 44.1%. The loans to institution programs aided 75 institutions in FY 1973. Loan cancellations of 10% were received by an estimated 74,000 new borrowers and 112,000 continuing borrowers in 1973. It is estimated that over 47,000 new and 32,000 continuing borrowers received cancellations of 15%. The total numbers of borrowers who received cancellations was estimated 265,000 in 1973. Loan applications from institutions were about 17% in excess of final panel-approved amounts in 1973 while panel-approved amounts exceed actual program appropriations by about 150%.

Program Effectiveness:

Program effectiveness can be partially measured by analysis of the distributions of family incomes of borrowers. An important objective of this legislation is to make these loans available to all needy students.

Of the students aided in Fiscal Year 1973, an estimated 91.0% were undergraduate and 9.0% were graduate students. It is estimated that 56%

of the students aided were from families with adjusted family incomes of less than $7,500; 37%, from $7,500 to $14,999; and 7% had family incomes of $15,000 or more. Table I below shows the income distribution of borrowers by institutional type and control from a study on the Impact of Office of Education Student Assistance Programs conducted by the American Council on Education.

Table I

Income Distribution of Participants in the
National Direct Student Loan Program Fall 1973

Adjusted Family Income	Two-Year Colleges	Four-Year Colleges	Universities	Public Institutions	Private Institutions
$0-7,499	70	53	55	63	46
$7,500-14,999	29	39	37	33	43
$15,000 and over	1	8	8	4	11
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

These distributions would appear to indicate that NDS loans are, in fact, going primarily to lower and lower middle income students although not to the degree as funds awarded under the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant, College Work-Study or Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Programs.

With regard to the effectiveness of program operations, despite efforts taken by the Office of Education and Congress to reduce the likelihood of default, the NDSL default rate continues to be of concern. In a study conducted by Educational Testing Service (ETS) the median annual NDSL default rate for all institutions in the ETS study was 13.5% in Fiscal Year 1972. Public universities in the ETS study had the lowest median annual NDSL default rate (10.9). Both private universities and private two-year institutions had identical median annual default rates of 13.9% and private four-year colleges had a median annual default rate of 11.8%. Public four-year colleges had a relatively high default rate of 15.1% but the highest default rate occured in two-year public institutions where the median annual default rate was almost 25%. The study also revealed that a lower delinquency rate is associated with having exit interviews with students who are dropping out of school, turning delinquent accounts over to either a lawyer or collection agency, discussing the schedule of repayments with the borrower as part of the exit interview, and having exit interviews with graduating borrowers.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Higher Education Research Institute of Los Angeles, California is currently engaged in the design of a study which will attempt to assess the impact of OE-sponsored student assistance programs. Details of a partially completed study conducted by the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey will be made available in the form of a final report and executive summary.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Higher Education. Factbook, 1974 Washington, D. C., 1973.

Unpublished data from Educational Testing Service of Princeton, New Jersey.

Higher Education Panel Reports, Number 18, American Council on Education. The Impact of Office of Education Student Assistance Program Fall, 1973. Washington, D. C., 1973.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Upward Bound Program

Legislation:

Higher Education Act of 1965. Title IV-A Subpart 4; Public Law 89-329; as amended by Public Law 90-575; as amended by Public Law 91-230; as amended by Public Law 92-318.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	*	*
1966	*	*
1967	*	*
1968	*	*
1969	*	*
1970	$56,680,000 1/	$29,601,000
1971	96,000,000 1/	30,000,000
1972	96,000,000 1/	31,000,000 2/
1973	100,000,000 1/	38,331,000
1974	100,000,000 1/	38,331,000
1975	100,000,000 1/	38,331,000

* There were no specific authorizations or appropriations for Upward Bound during these years. This was an OEO agency allocation made from the total appropriations of Title II-A of the Economic Opportunity Act.

1/Represents budget authority. Beginning in FY 1970 authorized funds were combined for the three programs of Special Services, Upward Bound, and Talent Search. A total of $100,000,000 is authorized for the three programs in FY 1974 and 1975 plus the new program of Educational Opportunity Centers.

2/Excludes $4 million supplemental appropriation for veterans projects.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Upward Bound is designed for the low-income high school student who, without the program, would not have considered college or other postsecondary school enrollment nor would he have been likely to have gained admission to and successfully completed a two or four-year college or other post-secondary school. In a typical year an Upward Bound student is a resident on a college, university, or secondary school campus for a six to eight-week summer session. In the academic year he may attend Saturday classes or tutorial/counseling sessions or participate in cultural enrichment activities. During his junior and senior years he explores many options for the post-secondary program best suited to his needs.

Upward Bound looks for the individual who has a demonstrated aptitude for a career which demands postsecondary education but whose inadequate high school preparation prevents him from meeting conventional requirements for admission to a college, university, or technical institute. The program designed to generate skills by means of remedial instruction, altered curriculum, tutoring, cultural exposure and encouragement.

Some program aspects include (1) coordination, where feasible, of Talent Search, Upward Bound, and Special Services for Disadvantaged Students; (2) projects to help students overcome motivational and academic barriers to acceptance at, and success in, a two or four-year college or other post-secondary school.

Recent Census data reveals that there are about 1,800,000 students in high school from poor families (less than $3,00 family income), and near poor families (less than $5,000 family income). These 1,800,000 students constitute the upper limit of the Upward Bound target population.

Census and other data also show that for the high school graduates of this low-income group, about 35 percent are entering college. Since about 55 percent of all high school graduates are now entering college, if low-income high school graduates (up to $5,000 family income) are to enroll in college at the same rate as all high school graduates, an additional 20 percent of these low-income high school graduates must enroll in college. In order to obtain national parity, the additional 20% of the target population must attend college. This amounts to approximately 360,000 students (.20 x 1,800,000).

Program Scope:

In Program Year 1974-75, 416 Upward Bound projects were funded (21 new projects and 395 continuing projects) with an average grant of $92,000. This includes the supplemental funds for veterans. Numbers of students aided by Upward Bound in program year 1974-75 are not yet available, but in program year 1973-74 the program aided an estimated 41,000 students (13,000 new and 28,000 continuing). An estimated 9,000 students were graduated from high school in calendar year 1973. About 82 percent of the graduates planned to attend college or other postsecondary institutions. By academic year 1975-76, the special effort to recruit, counsel, and enroll veterans will have been completed.

This effort began with a supplemental appropriation in program year 1972-73.

Program Effectiveness:

Program effectiveness can be estimated by determining whether Upward Bound participants have a better college enrollment and retention rate than the norm for their income group. A chart follows showing Upward Bound college entrance and retention rates, and the rates for a national sample of high school graduates. The rates for the low-income members of this national sample are also shown. *

The table includes the statistics on educational outcomes of former Upward Bound students as reported in the General Accounting Office's study of Upward Bound--see rows 4 and 5 (draft report dated 8-30-73). The statistics for the high school class of 1966 include only those members who completed high school, but the Upward Bound statistics, except for the last row, are for all former Upward Bound students whether they completed high school or not. By inspection of table, it is apparent that Upward Bound enrolls a much larger proportion of its students in college compared to the class of 1966. Upward Bound, however, has not been as successful in graduating as many from two-year and four-year colleges as have graduated from the class of 1966. This outcome must be seen in light of two additional facts: (1) a large proportion of former Upward Bound students are still enrolled in college; (2) Upward Bound students, more than two thirds of whom are members of racial and ethnic minority groups, typically are "high-risk" students, whereas those low-income members of the high school class of 1966 are mostly white students and contain only a small proportion of high-risk students. High-risk students also usually take longer to proceed through college than do "modal" students.

The on-going evaluation of the Special Services Program for Disadvantaged Students in Higher Education found that disadvantaged college students who had been enrolled in "bridge-type" high school level intervention porgrams, such as Upward Bound, had slightly higher grades in college than similar students who had not participated in such programs; but the practical significance of these grade differences was small. 5/

---

* The high school graduate class of 1966 was used because it is the latest year available for which adequate follow-up data exists through the college years.

Also, more than 75% of the poverty-level college students who had been enrolled in pre-college intervention programs felt that these intervention efforts did not influence their decision to go to college.

A recently completed comprehensive review of research 6/ on the effectiveness of secondary and higher education intervention programs for disadvantaged students found that these programs have tended to utilize old strategies to meet the demands of new problems. Most, if not at all, of these programs have confronted the problems of intervention in very much the same manner. There has been very little experimentation with different modes of educational intervention. Also, little thought has been given to the development of criteria of effectiveness to measure the achievement of program objectives. Typically, program administrators do not know when to alter a program, or when to reinforce a particular treatment, simply because they cannot tell if the treatment has been successful.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations:

An evaluation of the Upward Bound program has been commissioned by the Office of Education; the final report of this study will be available in 1975.

The prime objective of this study is to determine how effectively students utilize these programs, what program methods are most effective, and what improvements can be made in program administration in light of these findings. Another major purpose of this evaluation is to see if the participants truly require the services this program provides, or whether the participants would have entered college without the assistance of the program.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Program Data
2. Census of Population 1970: Detailed Characteristics Final Report PC(1)-D1 U. S. Summary, Table 267; 1970 number of students enrolled in high school with income below the poverty level in 1969; as used in the preliminary design for the ongoing evaluation of the Upward Bound program
3. U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20 No. 222, "School Enrollment: October 1970," derived from tables 14 and 15, and unpublished data obtained from the Bureau of the the Census.

4. Sources to Table following

"High School Class of 1966 (rows 1 and 2)"

From a national probability sample of the high school class of 1966. The data were originally collected in October 1965 and there have been several follow-up surveys. The educational outcomes used here were collected in the fourth follow-up survey in winter-spring 1971. Data are collected by the Census Bureau for the study. A. J. Jaffe and Walter Adams. "1971-72 Progress Report and Findings: Follow-up of a Cross-section of 1965-66 High School Senior," Progress Report to the U. S. Office of Education, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, New York, July 1972, processed. The statistics are reprecentaged from Tables 1a, 1b, and 10b.

"Former Upward Bound Students" and "Entrants to Upward Bound in 1966 (rows 3 and 4)." Data from the General Accounting Office's report on the Upward Bound Program, pp. 9 and 15.

"Upward Bound Completions in 1966, (row 5)." From the 1973 Upward Bound Post-Secondary Report, October 16, 1973, Division of Student Assistance, U. S. Office of Education, national summary table.

5. The Impact of Special Services Programs in Higher Education for "Disadvantaged" Students, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey (draft final report of phase two of the evaluation of the program for Special Services for Disadvantaged Students in Higher Education).

6. Vincent Tinto and Roger H. Sherman, The Effectiveness of Secondary and Higher Education Intervention Programs: A Critical Review of the Research, Teachers College, Columbia University, September 1974 (Final report submitted to the Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation of the U. S. Office of Education).

A COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES OF FORMER UPWARD BOUND PARTICIPANTS COMPARED WITH COHORTS OF THE HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 1966 1/

Outcomes 2/ Initial Group	(1) High School Graduates	(2) College Entrants (2+1)	(3) College Graduates (3+2)	(4) Currently Enrolled in College (4+2)	(5) Graduated or Currently Enrolled (3+4) (5+2)	(6) Dropouts (6+2)	(7) Proportion of High School Graduates to College Graduates & Currently Enrolled in College (5÷1)
High School Class of 1966 N=1, 013 100%	1,013 (100%)	553 (55%)	250 (45%)	116 (21%)	366 (66%)	187 (34%)	36%
High School Class of 1966; income less than $5,000 N=225 100%	225 (100%)	77 (34%)	24 (31%)	19 (25%)	43 (56%)	34 (44%)	19%
Former Upward Bound Students N=71, 567 100%	50,366 (70%)	35,431 (70%)	996 (3%)	20,261 (57%)	21,257 (60%)	14,174 (40%)	42%
Entrants to Upward Bound in 1966 N=14, 394 100%	12,710 (88%)	8,988 (71%)	671 (7.5%)	2,381 (26.5%)	3,052 (34%)	5,936 (66%)	24%
Upward Bound Completion in 1966 N=908 100%	908 (100%)	552 (61%)	197 (36%)	30 (5%)	227 (41%)	325 (59%)	25%

1/ Percentages in Column 2 are based on division by the number of graduates in Column 1. Percentages in Columns 3-6 are based on division by the number of college entrants in Column 2. Column 7 is based on the division of Column 5 by Column 1.

2/ Read across for each "Initial Group" for comparative outcomes, i.e., college enrollment and retention among groups and down for identification of cohort.

Sources: See previous page under "Sources of Evaluation Data."

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Talent Search Program

Legislation:

Higher Education Act of 1965. Title IV-A, Subpart 4; Public Law 89-329; as amended by Public Law 90-575; as amended by Public Law 91-230; as amended by Public Law 92-318.

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	*	$2,000.000
	1967	*	2,500,000
	1968	*	4,000,000
	1969	$4,000,000	4,000,000
	1970	56,000,000 1/	5,000,000
	1971	96,000,000 1/	5,000,000
	1972	96,000,000 1/	5,000,000
	1973	100,000,000 1/	6,000,000
	1974	100,000,000 1/	6,000,000
	1975	100,000,000 1/	6,000,000

* Such sums as may be necessary

1/ Represents budget authority. Beginning in FY 1970 funds authorized were combined for the three programs of Special Services, Upward Bound, and Talent Search. In FY 1975 a total of $100,000,000 is authorized for these three programs, plus the new program, Educational Opportunity Centers.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Talent Search is a project grant program which works through institutions of higher education, public and private agencies and organizations to provide services to low-income youth in secondary schools, or dropouts. The ultimate goal of this program is to equalize post-secondary educational opportunities for low-income students through: (1) identification and encouragement of qualified youth having financial or cultural needs; (2) publicizing of existing forms of student financial aid; and (3) encouragement of secondary-school or college dropouts of demonstrated scholastic aptitude to re-enter educational programs.

The Commissioner may enter into contracts with or award grants to institutions of higher education, combinations of institutions of higher education, and public and private agencies and organizations. Funding selections are made on the basis of funding criteria and general criteria published in the Federal Register.

Program Scope:

The 1970 decennial census reveals that there are about 3.2 million 14 to 24 year olds, enrolled and not enrolled in school, with 1 to 4 years of high school who have incomes below the poverty level. This group constitutes the broad target population for Talent Search. Even if the Talent Search target population were limited to the top two ability quartiles within the low income quartile, the Talent Search universe of need would still be 918,000.

Program Effectiveness:

During academic year 1974-75, 120 projects have been funded with the $6 million appropriation; of these projects, 110 are continuing and 10 are new. Average cost per project is $50,000, and average cost per client is estimated to be $53, based on an estimated total of 112,515 clients to be served. In the 1973-74 academic year, 32,941 were placed in postsecondary education. More than 13,000 actual or potential dropouts were persuaded to return to school or college. Slightly more than 3200 were enrolled in high school equivalency programs. In addition, 13,298 veterans were placed in postsecondary education and 4843 were enrolled in high school equivalency programs through the Talent Search effort of the Special Veterans component of the Upward Bound program.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation of the Talen Search Program has been commissioned and the final report will be available early in 1975. Objectives of this study are to perform a descriptive analysis of the operations of the program, to test the validity of program data, and to recommend improvements in program administration.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program files.
U.S. Census of Population 1970: Detailed Characteristics Final Report PC(1)-D1 U.S. Summary, Tables 267 and 268; as used in the preliminary design for the Talent Search evaluation.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program files.

U. S. Census of Population 1970: Detailed Characteristics Final Report PC(1)-D1 U.S Summary, Tables 267 and 268; as used in the preliminary design for the Talent Search evaluation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Opportunity Centers

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Act of 1965. Title IV-A, Subpart 4; as amended by Public Law 92-318.	June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1974	1/	$ 3,000,000
	1975		3,000,000

1/ $100,000,000 is authorized for the four programs that comprise the Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students in Higher Education.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Educational Opportunity Centers provide information and counseling services to all residents in its service areas, which are defined as areas with major concentrations of low-income populations. The Centers may also provide tutorial services to students attending postsecondary institutions in their respective service areas and also serve as recruiting and counseling pools for such institutions.

The first year of operation for the Centers will be academic year 1974-75. This program requires 25% matching funds from the grantee.

Program Scope:

Recent census data shows that there are about 3.2 million youths 14 to 24 years old, enrolled and not enrolled in school, with one to four years of high school, with family incomes below the poverty level. This group, along with those disadvantaged youths already enrolled in postsecondary education, constitute the core of the target population of the centers. (The disadvantaged college student group comprises about 14 percent of undergraduates in college.) In addition, there are many persons over age 24 who would be eligible for and in need of the services these centers provide.

In academic year 1974-75, the first year of operation for this program, there will be twelve centers serving 50,000 persons at a cost of approximately $60 per student. There is at least one center in each of the ten OE regions.

Program Effectiveness:

The centers have just begun operation in academic year 1974-5 and program effectiveness information is not yet available.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None funded at this time.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

None.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Special Services for Disadvantaged Students in Higher Education

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Act of 1965. Title IV-A, Subpart 4; Public Law 89-329; as amended by Public Law 90-575; as amended by Public Law 91-230; as amended by Public Law 92-318; as amended by Public Law 93-380.	June 30, 1975

Funding History	Year	Authorization [1]	Appropriation
	1970	$ 56,000,000	$ 10,000,000
	1971	96,000,000	15,000,000
	1972	96,000,000	15,000,000
	1973	100,000,000	23,000,000
	1974	100,000,000	23,000,000
	1975	100,000,000	23,000,000

[1] Represents budget authority. Beginning in FY 1970 funds authorized were combined for the three programs of Special Services, Upward Bound, and Talent Search. A total of $100,000,000 is authorized for these programs in FY 1975 including the Educational Opportunity Centers.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Special Services is a discretionary project grant program making awards to institutions of higher education to provide services for students with academic potential who because of educationl, cultural, or economic background, or physical handicap or limited English speaking ability, are in need of remedial or other supportive services, or require bilingual educational teaching, guidance, and counseling, in order to pursue a post secondary education. The program is forward-funded and no matching funds are required by the grantee institutions.

Program Scope:

Recent Census data [2] shows that there were about 1,200,000 poor and near-poor (up to $5,000 family income) eleventh and twelfth grade high school students. At least 65 percent (800,000) within this income group will be expected to graduate from high school, and about 35 percent (280,000) of the high school graduates will be expected to enter college eventually. The 280,000 low-income students, plus those physically handicapped students from families above $5,000 income, constitute the upper limit of the target population in need of special services. Evidence from the almost completed study of the special services program reveals that, in fall of 1971, 14 percent of all undergraduates came from families with an income that placed them within the federal government's poverty classification; this is the target population for the Special Services program. Also, while about half of all colleges report enrolling 11 percent or more financially disadvantaged undergraduates, only about 25 percent of all colleges have a post-matriculation special services type program for low-income students. (Some of the other 75% provide the needed services even though they may not have an explicit program.) The principal source of support for these programs is the federal government, with only about 15 percent supported by regular institutional funds, and less than 10 percent by private foundations. According to the study underway, the most frequent program components found in more than six of every ten programs (from all funding sources) are academic counseling and advising, special recruiting strategy, and tutoring. About half provide for diagnosis of learning difficulty or for remedial courses, and almost half report use of special instructional media or strategies. Almost half involve cooperative efforts with community agencies or organizations; about the same proportion contain job placement elements. Guidance for graduate study appears in about one in every five programs. Slightly more than half of the programs are concerned with the administration of student grants, work-study, and/or loans.

Programs funded as federal Special Services Programs tend to have a wider variety of the several components than do programs funded from other sources. Also, the content of the programs is influenced by institutional goals: i.e., selective institutions more frequently provide tutoring or guidance toward graduate study, and provide remedial courses less frequently than do non-selective institutions. Programs on traditionally white campuses differ in content from those on traditionally black campuses only in the greater frequency of (recruiting components.)

In FY 1974, 331 projects were funded (21 new and 310 continuing), at an average cost of $69,000 per project, serving an estimated 73,950 students. The average cost per student is estimated to be $311.

Program Effectiveness:

Program records show that in FY 1973 (program year 1973-74), almost 12,000 students participating in the Special Services program successfully completed the program: about 6,600 students showed adequate academic and personal adjustment and moved out of the program into the regular academic channels of the host institutions; about 3,700 graduated from the host institutions, and about 1,400 left the host institutions to transfer to other colleges, and presumably, were, making satisfactory progress or transfer would not have been possible.

8

An evaluation study 3/ of the Special Services Program has shown that most of these types of programs are quite new; the average (median) age of the programs reported (whether federal or non-federaly supported) was 2.6 years in 1972, and only three percent had existed ten years or more. Therefore, it was too early to evaluate program impact by numbers persevering to a bachelor's degree or continuing into graduate study.

Also, the studyhas revealed that being disadvantaged is much more than a financially determined phenomenon. There are greater differences among students of different ethnic classification within the low-income group than there are between poverty-level and modal (typical) students within the same ethnic classification. Differences between physically handicapped students and modal students are relatively minor--except for the fact of the physical disability. Between the poverty-level and modal students, the study did not find substantial differences by major field of study, content of freshman courses taken, or relative difficulty with such courses. Most students in the study were in their first or second year and differences in these areas may show up later in their college careers.

As expected, the poverty-level students reported a higher degree of participation in the services offered by the special services programs than did the modal students. This differential participation was particularly large in professional counseling on financial problems and assistance, but was also greater for: tutoring by students and professors; professional counseling on career choices; remedial courses and courses on reading skill development; programs to improve writing and number skills; reducing course load; professional counseling for personal and academic problems, and several other areas.

Although substantial positive changes occurred among Special Services Program participants in attitudes, values, and motivation, there was little positive indication of any significant impact of the program on the academic achievement of the target population. Special Services students did not reduce the gap in college grade point average between themselves and the regularly admitted (modal) students, differences between high school and college grades for the two groups remaining approximately the same. The college environment, while not tending to magnify previous differences in academic achievement, does not appear to be compensating for such differences. Overall, the academic success of disadvantaged students at institutions with Special Services Programs was no greater, or no less, than at colleges without such programs. This outcome did not appear to be affected by any differential emphasis upon specific programatic elements such as tutoring or counseling. There was no evidence that the colleges these students were in, or any support services available to them, were helping these students to exceed the level of performance that would be expected of them in college given their level of performance in high school.

With reagrd to disadvantaged students' own life, these students were relatively most satisfied at four-year predominantly white institutions and relatively less satisfied at two-year community colleges; traditionally black colleges fell in-between these two groups.

In summary, preliminary results from the draft final report 4/ of the Special Services evaluation indicate little, if any, positive impact of the Special Services Program.

A recently completed comprehensive review 5/ of research on the effectiveness of secondary and higher education intervention programs for disadvantaged students found that such programs at the post-secondary level have had some positive impact upon program participants. These programs appear to have been somewhat effective in increasing retention of disadvantaged youth in college. In some instances, academic achievement appears to have been improved, but still remained below institutional averages for regularly admitted students. While these programs appear to assist some persons, it is entirely possible for self-selection to have caused these outcomes, and "creaming" of participants has been observed in a number of these types of programs. As with intervention programs at the secondary school level, the strategy used to keep disadvantaged youths in college varied little among programs. Most programs provided remedial instruction, tutoring, and counseling, but differed in the extent to which they tried to integrate their participants into college activities. Like high school level intervention efforts, higher education intervention has not had a major impact on the organization and operation of colleges.

The college level programs have approached the problems of compensatory education for disadvantaged students with little variation: they tend to offer old strategies to meet new problems, and there has been very little experimentation with different modes of educational intervention. Similarly, little thought has been given to the criteria to be used to gauge the achievement of program objectives. Since program administrators cannot tell whether a strategy has been effective or not, they cannot know when to change or reinforce that strategy. Careful experimentation with varying techniques in varying settings is needed before such programs can advance beyond their skimpy success.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, is conducting an evaluation study which will be completed early in 1975. This evaluation project involves a number of interrelated activities. These included (1) a survey of all U. S. institutions of higher education, in order to provide a census of special service type programs, numbers of students served, and costs; (2) a intensive questionnaire survey of a sample of 120 institutions, to obtain detailed data on programs, staff, students served, etc.; (3) visits to 30 of these institutions, for discussions with key college staff and special service program directors, in order to observe the functioning of the programs and to determine their interaction with the total education program; (4) personal interviews with about 1,000 disadvantaged students in a subsample of some 60 of the 120 institutions, to look in depth at the college experience of the target population, and (5) a questionnaire survey of 12,000 regular and disadvantaged students at the sample 120 institutions (a) to compare the "disadvantaged" and "typical" students perceptions and attitudes toward the total college experience, (b) to examine the disadvantaged student's academic success, the degree of satisfaction they have with their progress, and their evaluations of the special programmatic features available to them.

The outcome of the evaluation will be an analysis of the impact of college, and more specifically, the program upon the student: level of academic performance; degree of satisfaction with a variety of aspects of life in college and with the assistance received; knowledge and use of special program features; aspirations and expectations for continued study; and, adoption of general values inherent in the goals of highe education. The study includes students in the federally supported special services program as well as disadvantaged students in non-federally supported special services-type programs.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Program files

2. U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 222, "School Enrollment: October 1970," derived from tables 14 and 15, and unpublished data obtained from the Bureau of the Census.

3. Programmatic Attention to "Disadvantaged" Students by Institutions of Higher Education in the United States: A Census for 1971-72, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, April 1973, (Final report from phase one of the evaluation of the program for Special Services for Disadvantaged Students in Higher Education).

4. The Impact of Special Services Programs in Higher Education for "Disadvantaged" Students, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, (draft final report of phase two of the evaluation of the program for Special Services for Disadvantaged Students in Higher Education).

5. Vincent Tinto and Roger H. Sherman, The Effectiveness of Secondary and Higher Education Intervention Programs: A Critical Review of the Research, Teachers College, Columbia University, September 1974 (Final report submitted to the Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation of the U. S. Office of Education).

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Strengthening Developing Institutions

Legislation: Expiration Date:

Higher Education Act of 1965, Title III;
Public Law 89-329, as amended.

June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$ 55,000,000	$ 5,000,000
1967	30,000,000	30,000,000
1968	55,000,000	30,000,000
1969	35,000,000	30,000,000
1970	70,000,000	30,000,000
1971	91,000,000	33,850,000
1972	91,000,000	51,850,000
1973	120,000,000	87,500,000
1974	120,000,000	99,992,000
1975	120,000,000	

Program Purpose and Operations:

This is a program of special assistance to strengthen the academic quality of developing institutions. As stipulated by law, developing institutions are defined as: (1) those providing an educational program which awards B.A. or A.A. degrees, (2) those accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or making reasonable progress toward accreditation, (3) satisfying both of the above stipulations during the five academic years preceding the academic year for which assistance is sought (waivers may be made for institutions which serve to increase higher education for Indians and Spanish-speaking people), (4) being public or non-profit, and (5) meeting such other requirements as the Commissioner shall prescribe by regulation. The law holds that such prescriptions shall include indication that the institution is: (a) making a reasonable effort to improve the quality of its teaching and administrative staffs and of its student services and (b) for financial or other reasons, struggling for survival and isolated from the main currents of academic life.

Section 305 of Public Law 92-318 allows the Commissioner to financially assist developing institutions under certain programs under the Higher Education Act. Under this provision and at the Commissioner's discretion, the non-Federal institutional share of costs for participating in the various programs in Titles II, IV, VI, and VII may be waived for institutions which have been certified as developing institutions.

In FY 1973, the program was administratively divided into the Basis Institutional Development Program and the Advanced Institutional Development Program. Both branches provide assistance to qualified applicant institutions in the form of grants which are awarded competitively on the basis of realistic long-range plans and relative ratings along quantitative and qualitative parameters which are designed to assess institutional ability to make effective use of an award. Basic developing institutions receive one-year grants for improvement of curriculum, faculty; administration, and student services. Advanced developing institutions receive multi-year grants, which may extend up to five years, for developing planning, management, and evaluation capability, for undertaking special purpose programs, and for promoting financial self-sufficiency. The Basic Branch operates much as the program did upon implementation; the objective of the Advanced Branch is to select among relatively highly developed applicants and accelerate the strengthening of their academic quality.

Program Scope:

In FY 1974, the Basic program awarded $51,992,000 to 215 institutions -- an average grant of $241,823. Of these, 110 schools are public (47 four-year and 63 two-year) and 105 are private (89 four-year and 67 two-year). One hundred fourty-eight institutions are predominantly white (81 four-year and 67 two-year) and 67 are predominantly black (55 four-year and 12 two-year).

The Advanced program awarded $48,000,000 to 36 institutions -- an average grant of $1,333,333. Of these, 19 schools are public (7 four-year and 12 two-year) and 17 are private (16 four-year and one two-year). Eighteen institutions are predominantly white (9 four-year and 9 two-year) and 18 are predominantly black (14 four-year and 4 two-year).

Program Effectiveness:

Findings of the most recent evaluation study indicate that:

1. Institutional development may be better viewed as a sequential process, during which institutions pass from one stage of development to another--each of which exhibits a particular set of needs. The amount and type of funding should be correlated with each institution's stage of development.

2. The size of a grant is not necessarily as significant with regard to impact as are continuity of funding and the quality of leadership. A lower level of continuous funding may be more productive than patterns of intermittant, but higher, funding (which may disrupt plans and development). Increases and decreases of funding are best instituted gradually.

3. Strong--but not authoritarian--presidential leadership is correlated with the vitality and success of programs.

4. The role of the program coordinator on most campuses was not effective; tasks were assigned to over-burdened administrators who were unable to devote sufficient time to pertinent tasks.

5. Effectiveness of some consortia was inhibited because members were either geographically distant, or significantly different in pertinent characteristics, or pursued distinctively diverse goals.

6. Use of consultants sometimes proved less beneficial than anticipated--primarily because their employment was too brief to ensure successful implementation of programs.

7. Most developing institutions are relatively unskilled with respect to internal collection and transfer of information.

8. Most successful uses of funds were for curriculum development, National Teaching Fellows, in-service training of faculty, advanced graduate training for faculty, use of outside consultants, establishment of new institutional administrative offices, and for counselling and guidance activities.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

"A Study Design for Evaluation of HEA Title III," Arthur D. Little, Inc. Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

"A Study of Title III of the Higher Education Act:
The Developing Institutions Program," Center for
Research and Development in Higher Education,
University of California, Berkeley,
January 1974

Title III Program Files

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Annual Interest Grants

Legislation:

Title VII-C, Section 745 of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1965; as amended by the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 (formerly Title III, Section 306 of the Higher Education Act of 1963; P.L. 88-204)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975

Funding History	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1969	$ 5,000,000	$ 3,920,000
	1970	11,750,000	11,750,000
	1971	25,250,000	21,000,000
	1972	38,750,000	29,010,000
	1973	52,250,000	14,069,000
	1974	(Such sums as may be necessary)	31,425,000
	1975	"	-0-*

* No appropriation is requested for continuing grant obligations in FY 1975, as a result of a change in the obligation accounting procedures for the program. A new procedure was instituted wherein all outstanding obligations were de-obligated so that program obligations will agree contractually with the years in which payments commence under each grant agreement.

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program became operationa in FY 1970 both to encourage the use of private capital for construction of academic facilities and to reduce the interest burden on borrowers to a level commensurate with direct loans for construction of academic facilities. Institutions of higher education and higher education building agencies (i.e., state agencies empowered by the State to issue tax-exempt bonds on behalf of private institutions of higher education) may apply for Federal annual interest grant assistance on loans obtained in the private market. Loans of up to 90% of the cost of a project may be eligible for subsidies over a fixed period which may not exceed forty years. Subsidy payments, do not commence until either long-term financing arrangements are consumated or until the project is completed--whichever is later. Subsidies represent the difference between the interest amounts payable at the commerical rate on the loan and the amount payable at an interest rate of 3%. No more than 12.5% of the annual appropriations for this program may be used for grants in any one State.

Program Scope

No new grant awards were authorized in 1974 or 1975. Since its inception in 1970, the program through 1973 has had considerable impact in assisting higher education in the long term financing of academic facilities. Over 700 projects have been approved to receive a total of approximately $29 million in annual grant payments to subsidize the interest cost on approximately $1.5 billion in long term capital loans.

Program Effectiveness:

Since the inception of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Federal government has provided financial assistance for the construction of academic facilities throughout the 54 states and territories. During the period fiscal year 1965 through fiscal year 1974 over $2.5 billion in direct Federal grants and loans were awarded. In addition, almost $1.5 billion in commercial loans were approved for annual interest subsidy support involving an annual commitment of Federal funds approximating $29 million. Over 1800 institutions of higher education received financial assistance for the purpose of facilities construction and some 4,000 facilities costing in excess of $10 billion will have been constructed.

Findings of an USOE planning study [1/] report that the total stock of space in 1974 approximated 1,332,300,000 net assignable square feet. Roughly 25% of this total was constructed between academic years 1968-69 and 1973-74. In addition, construction which will be completed by 1976 will supplement the total stock by an estimated 80,000,000 square feet. The study also found that nationally aggregated comparisons of space standards with the space available showed few shortages both for those categories where very specific space standards have been established (i.e., classrooms, laboratories, and office space) as well as for special use, general use, and support space, while nonacademic space shows some excess capacity. When disaggregated, the data show a tendency for some schools (particularly two-year private colleges) to be space-rich and for others (generally, public universities and public two-year colleges) to show some shortages as a consequence of shifts in enrollment patterns.

In view of the large amount of construction over the last 10 years and the anticipated leveling off of higher education enrollments, it appears that the Federal assistance programs for construction of higher education facilities have generally accomplished the objective. While certain areas of the country may still face a shortage of academic space, these deficiencies are believed to be limited, and the situation does not constitute a national problem.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1/ The Demand for Facilities in the Post-Secondary Sector, Joseph Froomkin, Inc., September 1974.

Program Files, Division of Training and Facilities, Bureau of Post-Secondary Education.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Grants for Construction of Undergraduate Academic Facilities

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Title VII-A of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1965; as amended by the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 (formerly Title I of the HEFA 1963; P.L. 88-204)	June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$ 230,000,000	$ 230,000,000
1966	460,000,000	458,000,000
1967	475,000,000	453,000,000
1968	728,000,000	400,000,000
1969	936,000,000	83,000,000
1970	936,000,000	76,000,000
1971	936,000,000	43,000,000
1972	50,000,000	43,000,000
1973	200,000,000	43,000,000*
1974	300,000,000	---
1975	300,000,000	---

* Funds appropriated in Fiscal Year 1973 were released to the program in May 1974 for obligation during Fiscal Years 1974 and 1975.

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to provide grants to higher education institutions to finance the construction, rehabilitation and improvement of undergraduate facilities.

Funds for public community colleges and public technical institutes under this program are allotted to each state by a formula based on the number of high school graduates and per capita income of residents. Funds for other institutions are allotted to each state by a formula based on the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education and the number of students in grades 9 through 12. Within each state, federal grants may be awarded for up to 50 percent of the project development cost. Twenty four percent of funds appropriated under the Title are reserved for community and technical schools.

Grants are not given for the construction of facilities for which admission is normally charged, for facilities used for sectarian instruction, for facilities for schools of the health professions as defined in the Higher Education Facilities Act, or for residential, dining, and student union facilities.

The law requires that each state establish a Commission for Higher Education Facilities, which would determine priorities, including those regarding the allocation of Federal funds to each project.

Program Scope:

In FY 1974, 13 grants totalling $3,053,000 were made.

Program Effectiveness:

Since the inception of the Higher Education Act of 1963, the Federal government has provided financial assistance for the construction of academic facilities throughout the 54 states and territories. During the period fiscal year 1965 through fiscal year 1974 over $2.5 billion in direct Federal grants and loans were awarded. In addition, almost $1.5 billion in commerical loans were approved for annual interest subsidy support involving an annual commitment of Federal funds approximating $29 million. Over 1800 institutions of higher education received financial assistance for the purpose of facilities construction and some 4,000 facilities costing in excess of $10 billion will have been constructed.

Findings from USOE evaluation study [1] indicate that the total stock of space in 1974 approximated 1,332,300,000 net assignable square feet. Roughly 25% of this total was constructed between academic years 1968-69 and 1973-74. In addition, construction which will be completed by 1976 will supplement the total stock by an estimated 80,000,000 square feet. The study also found that nationally aggregated comparisons of space standards with the space available showed few shortages both for those categories where very specific space standards have been established (i.e., classrooms, laboratories, and office space) as well as for special use, general use, and support space; while nonacademic space shows some excess capacity. When disaggregated, the data show a tendency for some schools (particularly two-year private colleges) to be space-rich and for others (generally, public universities and public two-year colleges) to show some shortages as a consequence of shifts in enrollment patterns.

Considering the large amount of construction over the last 10 years, and the anticipated leveling off of enrollments, it appears that the objectives of the higher education facilities construction program have been met. While certain areas of the country may still face a shortage of academic space, the situation does not constitute a national problem.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1/ The Demand for Facilities in the Post-Secondary Sector, Joseph Froomkin, Inc., September 1974.

Program Files, Division of Training and Facilities, Bureau of Post-Secondary Education.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:	Expiration Date:
State Postsecondary Education Commissions	June 30, 1975

Legislation:

Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended; Title XII, Section 1202; Public Law 89-329, as amended.

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1965	$ 3,000,000	$ 3,000,000
	1966	2,000,000	2,000,000
	1967	7,000,000	7,000,000
	1968	7,000,000	7,000,000
	1969	7,000,000	7,000,000
	1970	7,000,000	6,000,000
	1971	7,000,000	6,000,000
	1972	7,000,000	6,000,000
	1973	--	3,000,000
	*1974	--	3,000,000
	*1975	--	3,000,000

*The Higher Education Amendments of 1972, P.L. 92-318, amended Title XII of HEA of 1965 to require the establishment of State postsecondary Education Commissions if a State desired to participate in the comprehensive planning grants program authorized under Section 1203 of HEA. These State Commissions, popularly called Section 1202 State Commissions in reference to the section of the law authorizing them, could also, at the State's discretion, be the State Commission for the Undergraduate Instructional Equipment Grant Program under Part A of Title VI of HEA, and for the Undergraduate Academic Facilities Construction Grant Program under Title VII-A of HEA, and the State agency for the community services and the continuing education program HEAI as amended. In FY 1974 and FY 1975, funds were appropriated for the Section 1202 State Commissions to conduct comprehensive planning under Section 1203 of the HEA and for the Higher Education Facilities Commissions to administer the Titles VI-A and VII-A programs.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Section 1202 (a) of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-318) amended Title XII of HEA 1965 to require the establishment of State Post-Secondary Education Commissions if a State desired to participate in the comprehensive planning grants program, authorized under Section 1203.

Section 1202 (c) provides that these commissions may also (for the Community Services & Continuing Education Program, Title I HEA) participate in the Undergraduate Instructional Equipment Grant Program (Title VI-A, HEA 1965) and the Undergraduate Academic Facilities Construction Grant Program (Title VII-A, HEA 1965) -- at the State's discretion. Section 1202 (c) further authorizes the payment of funds to the 1202 commissions to cover the costs of administering the State Plans required under Titles VI-A and VII-A. Section 1202 (d) provides that if a State desires to participate in the Titles VI-A and VII-A programs but does not desire to assign the Titles VI-A and VII-A functions to the Section 1202 State Commission it must establish a separate State commission which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and technical institutes) in the State. These separate State commissions, popularly known as the Higher Education Facilities Commissions, were originally established to enable a State to participate in the Undergraduate Academic Facilities Program when it was authorized under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 and the Undergraduate Equipment Grant Program under Title VI-A, HEA. Funds to cover the cost of administration of State plans for the Higher Education Facilities Commissions are authorized under Section 421 of the GEPA.

Program Scope:

In FY 1974, $3 million was appropriated for State Postsecondary Education Commissions with appropriate language in the Appropriations Bill to allow a portion of these funds to be used to support costs incurred by the State Higher Education Facilities Commissions in administering the Titles VI-A and VII-A programs. Accordingly, $1.2 million was made available to Section 1202 State Commissions to conduct comprehensive planning under Section 1203 of the Higher Education Act with each of the 45 State 1202 Commissions which applied being awarded a grant of $26,105. $1.8 million was made available for administrative support of the State Facilities Commissions, with 56 such Commissions being awarded grants ranging in size from $6,000 to $68,000.

Program Effectiveness:

Each Section 1202 State Commission has employed an executive officer and appropriate staff and initiated both studies and inventories of all postsecondary education resources in the State.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program Files, Bureau of Post-Secondary Education,
Division of Training and Facilities.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Language Training and Area Studies

Legislation: Expiration Date:

National Defense Education Act of 1958. Title VI; Public Law 85-864; as amended by Public Law 88-665; as amended by Public Law 90-575; as amended by Public Law 92-318

June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1964	$ 8,000,000	$ 8,000,000
1965	13,000,000	13,000,000
1966	14,000,000	14,000,000
1967	16,000,000	15,800,000
1968	18,000,000	15,700,000
1969	16,050,000	15,450,000
1970	30,000,000	12,850,000
1971	38,500,000	7,170,000
1972	38,500,000	13,940,000
1973	50,000,000	12,500,000
1974	75,000,000	11,333,000
1975	75,000,000	11,300,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Programs for foreign language and area studies funded under this appropriation have four major purposes (1) increase the nation's manpower pool of trained specialists in foreign language, area studies, and world affairs; (2) provide in-service training to upgrade and update the professional knowledge and skills of existing specialists in foreign language, area studies, and world affairs; (3) produce new knowledge about other nations and cultures, particularly those of the non-Western world, through research and development; and (4) develop improved curricula and effective instructional materials in foreign languages, area studies, and world affairs needed by education, government, and business.

The National Defense Education Act, Title VI, authorizes the award of grants and contracts to U. S. educational institutions, organizations, and individuals for activities conducted primarily in the United States. Program assistance includes institutional development, fellowship support, and research in foreign language, area studies, world affairs, and intercultural understanding.

Program Scope:

Recent studies of foreign language and area studies programs in the U. S. reveal the growth in the development of non-Western studies since enactment of the NDEA in 1958. Whereas in 1958, some 37 "uncommonly taught" languages were offered in U. S. universities, in 1972 approximately 85 modern foreign languages were taught at NDEA VI centers alone. A 1970 survey of foreign language enrollments reveals that while higher education registrations in most of the foreign languages traditionally taught in American higher education have been in a distinct downward trend since 1968, student enrollments in Italian, Spanish, and in over 100 of the less commonly taught languages taken collectively have increased significantly--by 12.8%, 6.7%, and 39.4% respectively.

While enrollments in the uncommonly taught languages are increasing, total enrollments in these languages remain small. For example, in 1970 there were only 5,319 undergraduate and 796 graduate students studying Chinese, and only 12 undergraduates and 6 graduates studying Vietnamese. Recent indications are that enrollments in Chinese language courses have increased.

The NDEA foreign language training and area studies program provides a means for correcting existing disciplinary and geographic imbalances, broadening the scope of areas training, and improving and maintaining language skills.

In fiscal year 1974, $11,333,000 was available to fund 50 centers, 50 two-year undergraduate and 23 graduate programs, 835 graduate fellowships, and 27 research projects under NDEA Title VI.

World Area	Number of Centers	Obligations	Fall 1973 Estimated Enrollments
East Asia	8	$ 929,900	11,091
South Asia	6	547,962	4,375
Southeast Asia	3	290,500	2,061
Soviet & East Europe	8	735,000	9,937
Middle East	7	662,345	7,375
Africa	6	509,749	5,247
Latin America	6	462,870	17,244
International Studies[1/]	6	517,270	4,610
Total	50	$4,655,596	61,940

[1/] Includes the following centers: 1 West European, 1 Canadian, 1 Pacific Islands, 1 Inner Asian, 1 International Studies, 1 Comparative Studies.

Program Effectiveness:

A review of foreign language and area studies programs in the U. S. (based on a sample of 13,000 foreign language and area studies specialists, of whom about 10,000 are college or university faculty members) has provided data on the impact of the NDEA program. A sampling of previous holders of NDEA VI fellowships showed that almost all (89.1%) of the fellows used their foreign area training in their first job. Of the Ph.D graduates, 99% were employed as language and world area specialists. The survey also indicates that the existing pool of specialists needs more focused development in certain aspects in order to achieve an upgrading of language skills. Of the world area specialists surveyed, only 25% reported that they can easily speak, read, and write a language of their area. A major factor in acquiring and maintaining proficiency in foreign languages is the opportunity to utilize the language in the country where it is in regular use.

Studies on international and intercultural education, and new curricula and instructional materials are intended for use in schools and colleges throughout the U. S. The impact of this program is suggested by a materials utilization survey which provides specific data on instructional materials for 50 different languages in 82 foreign language and area studies programs. Results of the survey show, for example, that of 24 respondent institutions engaged in teaching Chinese, 21, or 88 percent were using materials produced under National Defense Education Title VI support; of 17 programs offering instruction in Hindi, 100 percent were using National Defense Education materials; and 6 out of 7 Arabic programs similarly reported utilization of National Defense Education-supported materials.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Language and Area Studies Review, Richard D. Lambert, (published in August 1973 by the American Academy of Political and Social Science and the Social Science Research Council).

International Studies and the Social Sciences: A Survey of the Status of International/Comparative Studies and Recommendations Concerning National Needs and Priorities, James N. Rosenau (Minneapolis, Minnesota: International Studies Association, June 1971).

1970 Census of International Programs in State Colleges and Universities, American Association of State Colleges and Universities (Washington, D. C.; AASCU Studies 1971/3, August 1971).

Program data.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Fulbright - Hays Act

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961. Section 102(b)(6); Public Law 87-256; as amended by Public Law 87-565; as amended by Public Law 89-698.	None

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1964	1/	$ 1,500,000
1965		1,500,000
1966		2,000,000
1967		3,000,000
1968		3,000,000
1969		3,000,000
1970		2,430,000
1971		830,000
1972		1,323,000
1973		1,360,000
1974		1,360,000
1975		2,700,000

1/ Indefinite, does not require specific money authorization.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Programs for foreign language and area studies funded under this appropriation have four major purposes: (1) increase the nation's manpower pool of trained specialists in foreign language and area studies, (2) provide inservice training to upgrade and update the professional knowledge and skills of existing specialists in foreign language, and area studies, (3) produce new knowledge about other nations and cultures, particularly those of the non-Western world; and (4) develop curricula and instructional materials in foreign language, and area studies, needed by education, government, and business.

Programs funded under the Fulbright-Hays Act Section 102(b)(6) provide opportunities to individuals for first-hand experiences in the locales of their respective specialization areas. Specifically, opportunities are provided for updating and extending research knowledge, and maintaining and improving language skills. The program also provides fellowships for faculty and doctoral dissertation research, supports group projects for research and training, as well as curriculum consultant services of foreign educators to improve foreign languages, area studies and intercultural education in U.S. schools and colleges.

Program Scope:

In fiscal year 1974 this program supported 92 doctoral dissertation research fellowships, 8 group projects, 14 curriculum consultant grants, and 16 faculty research fellowships.

Program Effectiveness:

A recent review of foreign language and area studies programs in the U.S. 1/ demonstrated that adequate opportunities for research and study abroad are critical to improving the quality of specialist training. Over 85% of those included in the survey reported a need to increase opportunities for studying language in its natural setting. While in absolute terms there has been substantial growth in the numbers of specialists with some overseas experience, the survey reveals that on the average the depth of experience abroad is inadequate. Furthermore, although as a group the specialists have had experience in a wide range of countries, the research of a majority of the specialists has been clustered in a small number of countries. In brief, a few countries are overstudied, relatively speaking, while a large number are understudied.

The Fulbright-Hays programs therefore provide a resource for training specialists in areas of greatest need and for helping improve the caliber of training in language and area studies through research and study abroad.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Source of Evaluation Data:

1/ Language and Area Studies Review, Richard D. Lambert, (published in August 1973 by the American Academy of Political and Social Science and the Social Science Research Council).

Program data.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Community Service and Continuing Education Program

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Act of 1965. Title I; Public Law 89-329, 20 U.S.C. 1001 as amended by Public Law 90-575; 20 U.S.C. 1001, 1005, 1006; as amended by Higher Education Amendments of 1972.	June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$25,000,000	$10,000,000
1967	50,000,000	10,000,000
1968	50,000,000	10,000,000
1969	10,000,000	9,500,000
1970	50,000,000	9,500,000
1971	60,000,000	9,500,000
1972	10,000,000	9,500,000
1973	30,000,000	15,000,000
1974	40,000,000	14,250,000
1975	50,000,000	14,250,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to provide grants to the States to strengthen those college and university programs which assist in the solution of community problems such as housing, transportation, and health. The program is administered by State agencies under State plans approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Each Agency establishes priorities for its State and is responsible for reviewing and approving proposals for funding. Funds are provided on a 66 2/3 percent Federal and a 33 1/3 percent non-Federal basis.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1972 extended this program through fiscal year 1975 and authorized the Commissioner to reserve up to 10% of the appropriation for grants and contracts to pay up to 90% of the cost of special programs and projects designed to seek solutions to national and regional problems concerning technological change and environmental pollution.

Program Scope:

In FY 1974, 646 grants were made to 741 institutions of higher education; 336 programs were carried over from prior year funding. As a result more than 496,500 adults participated in a total of 982 programs.

In FY 1974 the Commissioner, exercising the option granted him by the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 to set aside 10 percent of funds for special problems, funded eleven special demonstration projects totaling $1,425,000. These projects, with awards ranging from $84,890 to $179,069, focused on both national and regional problems. Included were projects relating to problems of the aging, effective uses of water resources, education for the deaf, and education for prison inmates.

Program Effectiveness:

In July 1974, a Federally funded study to evaluate the effectiveness of the Community Service and Continuing Education (CS/CE) Program was completed by Peak, Marwick and Mitchell, and Co. State Agencies administering the program were asked to nominate all programs they considered successful. From this group, twenty-five were selected for additional study. 11 projects were judged highly successful, based upon (1) institutional impact on community problem solving and (2) the degree to which a participating institution's community service and continuing education capability had been strengthened. One outcome of these projects was institution's heightened awareness of its community's problems. Less positive results emenated from an evaluation of Federal and State administration of the program. Researchers suggested that the problem lies with the ambiguity of the legislation as it relates to program scope. Finally, the report indicates that potential benefits from the program are high since it remains the only program focussing upon post-secondary institutions and community service.

On-going and Planned Evaluation Studies:

In 1972 the Congress directed the National Advisory Council on Extension & Continuing Education to carry out a comprehensive review of programs and projects carried out with Title I assistance since the program was enacted. A report on this survey was presented to Congress on March 31, 1975.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Bureau of Post-Secondary Education - Program Data Files

Peat, Marwick and Mitchell and Co., "Evaluation of Projects Supported under Title I of Higher Education Act of 1965, "Washington, D.C., July 1974 - part of the National Advisory Councils' review of the Title I program.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Land-Grant Colleges and Universities

Legislation:	Expiration Date
Second Morrill Act of 1890, as amended; 26 Stat. 417; 7 U.S.C. 322,323; Bankhead-Jones Act, as amended; 49 Stat. 439; Public Law 182; 7 U.S.C. 329 as amended Title IX, Sec. 506 Higher Education Amendments of 1972.	None

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation*
1964	$14,500,000	$14,500,000
1965	14,500,000	14,500,000
1966	14,500,000	14,500,000
1967	14,500,000	14,500,000
1968	14,500,000	14,500,000
1969	14,720,000	14,550,000
1970	14,922,000	14,720,000
1971	14,720,000	12,680,000
1972	14,720,000	12,600,000
1973	15,160,000	18,700,000**
1974	15,160,000	12,200,000
1975	15,160,000	12,200,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

A land-grant college or university is an institution designated by a State legislature for the benefits of the First Morrill Act of 1862 or the Second Morrill Act of 1890. The purpose of the original Act was to provide land in order to ensure the development in each State of at least one institution "to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanical arts." The Second Morrill Act provided for an appropriation of $25,000 for each State having a land-grant institution. The Nelson Amendment of 1907 doubled this appropriation to $50,000. The Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 provided for additional support. Puerto Rico was added in 1908; the District of Columbia in 1969; and both Guam and the Virgin Islands were so designed in 1973.

---

*Figures are the sum of permanent appropriations under the Second Morrill Act (i.e., $50,000 for each State and each jurisdiction regarded as a State for the purpose of this Act) and funds annually appropriated under the Bankhead-Jones Act.

**This figure includes a one-time appropriation of $6,000,000 for the two newly designated land-grant colleges of the Virgin Islands and Guam. Each jurisdiction received $3,000,000 to be invested in U.S. Government or other safe bonds, with the resulting interest to be used by the land-grant colleges.

In addition to the permanent appropriation provided under the Second Morrill Act, each of the 54 jurisdictions receives $150,000 under the Bankhead-Jones Act, with any additional allotment being apportioned among these jurisdictions in proportion to their populations. Monies are paid directly to State Treasurers and, in the event that more than one land-grant institution exists in a State, State Legislatures must provide by Statute for the division of these monies. Funds may not be used for the purchase of land nor may they be applied to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of buildings. Each land-grant institution is required to provide to the U.S. Office of Education an annual report on the expenditure of monies provided under this program.

Program Scope:

In Fiscal Year 1974, $12,200,000 was apportioned among the 54 jurisdictions in grants ranging in size from $200,500 to $382,900. The average grant per jurisdiction was $225,926. Approximately 94% of these funds were used for salaries of instructors and the remaining 6% was expended for instructional equipment. Over the history of the program, the average breakdown of expenditures has been 95% for faculty salaries and 5% for instructional equipment.

Of the 74 land-grant institutions,*only Cornell University in Ithaca retains an element of private control. It received $322,867 -- the total amount to the State of New York. Washington Technical Institute, the only two-year land-grant institution, received an award of $102,521 -- exactly one-half of the total amount received by the District of Columbia. The remaining 72 institutions (all four-year publics) received $11,774,612 -- the average award being $168,209.

Program Effectiveness:

The land-grant programs have had a major impact in assisting the land-grant institutionsto meet the continuing costs of instructional salaries.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program Files, Division of Training and Facilities, Bureau of Post-secondary Education

* MIT, also private, received $16,166.00 in FY 1974

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

College Teacher Fellowships

Legislation:

HEA Title IX, Part B (Replaces Title IV of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; Public Law 85-864; as amended; 20 U.S.C. 462.)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1976

Funding History:

Year	New Fellowships Authorized	New	Fellowships Support Continuing	Total	Appropriation
1965	3,000	3,000	3,000	6,000	$32,740,000 [1]
1966	6,000	6,000	4,500	10,500	55,961,000 [2]
1967	7,500	6,000	9,000	15,000	81,957,000 [3]
1968	7,500	3,328	12,000	15,328	86,600,000 [4]
1969	7,500	2,905	9,328	12,233	70,000,000
1970	7,500	2,370	6,233 (a)	8,603	48,813,000
1971	7,500	2,100	6,245 (b)	8,345	47,285,500
1972	7,500	0	4,650 (c)	4,650	26,910,000
1973	7,500	0	2,980 (d)	2,980	20,000,000
1974	7,500	0	880 (e)	880	5,806,000
1975	7,500	0	600 (f)	600	4,000,000

[1] $177,000 of FY 1965 appropriations were transferred for payment of teacher cancellations, NDEA II.

[2] $137,000 of FY 1966 appropriations were transferred for payment of teacher cancellations, NDEA II.

[3] $1,115,000 of FY 1967 appropriations were transferred for payment of teacher cancellations, NDEA II.

[4] $325,000 of FY 1968 appropriations were transferred for payment of teacher cancellations, NDEA II.

(a) Includes 170 special fellowships for veterans.
(b) Includes 770 special fellowships for veterans and 200 fourth year fellowships.
(c) Includes 180 special fellowships for veterans.
(d) Includes 880 special fellowships for veterans.
(e) All 880 fellowships are special fellowships for veterans.
(f) All 600

Program Purpose and Operation:

The aim of this program is to increase the supply of well-trained college teachers and encourage the development of doctoral level education on a broad geographic basis by providing three-year fellowship support for graduate students.

This program aids graduate schools in strengthening their doctoral programs, in developing interdisciplinary programs tailored to prepare teachers in fields of emerging manpower needs, and in helping veterans formerly on fellowships resume their education in order to prepare for academic careers.

Each fellowship covers a three year period and provides each fellow with a $3,000 a year stipend and $500 per year per dependent. In addition, a $3,000 per year educational allowance is provided to the institution for each fellow actively enrolled.

Panels of academic consultants review institutional applications and recommend specific doctoral programs to the Commissioner for final approval. Funds for these programs are made to institutions which reallocate them to individual graduate students selected by institutions themselves.

Program Scope:

Funds budgeted for the College Teacher Fellowship Program in FY 1975 will be used to support 600 returning veterans during the 1975-76 fellowship year as the program continues to be phased out in light of existing supply of and demand for recent graduates with advanced degrees. This represents a reduction of 31 percent from the 880 supported in FY 1974-75.

Program Effectiveness:

A study of the College Teacher Fellowship Program in July 1970 indicated that the program had been largely successful in promoting diversification of graduate study centers, in helping fellows gain a graduate degree in a shorter period than other doctoral students, and in lowering the attrition rate.

The changed focus of the program has made former measures of effectiveness inapplicable. However, as currently operating, the program is of direct assistance to returning veterans. It is too early to judge their completion rate. Judging from the past performance of fellows, it is assumed that 3/4 of the present group will be employed by institutions of higher education.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None planned.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Study of NDEA, Title IV Fellowship Program, Phase II, Bureau of Social Science Research, Washington, D.C., July 1970.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Higher Education Personnel Fellowships

Legislation:

Education Professions Development Act;
Part E, Section 541 and 542, Public Law
90-35; 20 U.S.C. 1119b and 20 U.S.C. 119b-1

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1976

Funding History:	Year	Total Authorization	Fellowships Appropriation
	1969	$ 21,500,000	$ 2,200,000
	1970	36,000,000	5,000,000
	1971	36,000,000	5,000,000
	1972	36,000,000	5,044,000
	1973	5% or more of total	2,172,000
	1974	5% or more of total	2,100,000
	1975	5% or more of total	530,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to increase the number and/or capabilities of teachers, administrators and specialists at the post-secondary level, in areas of critical need. Funds provide one and two-year fellowships for graduate study below the Ph.D. level in teaching fields and to the Ph.D. level in non-teaching fields.

Support is provided to:
(1) programs that have a high promise for improvement over past practices in their training of higher education personnel; (2) programs that prepare personnel for the higher education needs of students from low-income families; (3) programs that train and retrain teachers, administrators, or educational specialists for junior colleges and two-year community colleges located in urban areas; (4) programs that prepare personnel in higher education who will serve in developing institutions; (5) programs that prepare administrators, including trustees, presidents, deans, department chairmen, development officers, and financial aid officers; (6) programs that provide graduate level education for women training for careers in higher education; (7) programs that are a basic combination of the above priorities and which show evidence of effective communication between faculty, students, administration, and where appropriate, local communities in the planning and implementation of the proposed program.

Institutions of higher education apply directly to the Office of Education for fellowships. Applications are reviewed by panels of faculty members and administrators who represent American higher education. Their recommendations are made to the Commissioner of Education.

Fellowship support can be provided for one or two year programs. Financial assistance is distributed in the following manner: $3,000 paid to students for each fellowship year; fellows are entitled to $500 during the fellowship year for each eligible dependent; the institution receives $3,000 a year for each fellow to pay for his tuition and required non-refundable fees.

Program Scope

Some indication of the program's reach and operation can be obtained from program funding data and a study of recent graduates.

	Fiscal Year		
Output Measures	1972	1973	1974
Number of Institutions Participating	89	62	47
Number of Approved Programs	100	65	47
Number of Fellowship Awarded			
Total	912	441	316
(New)	(581)	(92)	(250)
(Continued)	(331)	(349)	(66)
Number of Fellowships Awarded in Training of Personnel As:			
Total	912	441	316
Teachers	(668)	(286)	(167)
Education Specialist	(118)	(44)	(67)
Administrators	(126)	(111)	(82)
Number of Fellowships Awarded to Train Personnel to Serve in:			
Total	912	441	316
Junior Colleges	(725)	(344)	(262)
Other Institutions	(187)	(97)	(54)
Average Yearly Amount of Fellowships	$5,471	$6,500	$6,500

Because of uncertainty concerning funding levels during recent years, fellowship awards have been restricted to one-year programs with possibility of renewal for an additional year. No initial two-year awards were made in FY 1974. For FY 1975, it is estimated that $530,000 will support 72 new fellowship awards.

Program Effectiveness:

A study [1] of 253 Part E fellows who have completed their training programs at 22 colleges and universities reveals that 62 percent have accepted jobs in institutions of higher education, some in leadership positions, 19 percent are employed in elementary or secondary education, 10 percent are continuing their education, 4 percent had resigned from the program, 2 percent were in military service, and 3 percent were unemployed.

In another sample, information volunteered from eleven institutions of higher education, which have approved programs designed to prepare personnel to work with the disadvantaged, shows that approximately 76 percent of the total or 86 fellowships were awarded to members of minority groups--Blacks, Spanish-speaking Americans, American Indians, and Orientals. In addition, just under 50 percent of the total 113 fellowships reported were awarded to women.

In yet another area, approximately 13 percent of the total 903 1971-72 Part E fellowships were awarded to military veterans.

In terms of using fellowship programs as an incentive to influence able students to pursue a given career, the data show that while only 20 percent of the respondents knew of the program prior to a decision on which school to attend, half of these students were clearly influenced in their choice because of this knowledge. Further, over forty percent of all fellows had modified their career plans after learning of the availability of funds.

Ongoing and Planned Studies:

No new studies planned.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1/ Abt Associates, Inc. A Study of the Education Professions Development Act Training Programs for Higher Education Personnel. Cambridge, Massachusetts. 1973.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

EPDA, Part E Institutes

Legislation:

Education Professions Development Act of 1967 as amended. Part E, Section 541 and 542, Public Law 90-35; 20 U.S.C. 119b and 20 U.S.C. 1119b-1

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1976

[Note: Section 543 was repealed by sec. 141(c)(1)(G) P.L. 92-318]

Funding History:	Year	Total Authorization	Institutes Appropriation
	1969	$ 21,500,000	$ 4,700,000
	1970	36,000,000	5,000,000
	1971	36,000,000	5,000,000
	1972	36,000,000	5,000,000
	1973	5% or more of the	5,132,000
	1974	total EPDA Appropriation	-0-
	1975	15,000,000	1,570,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to train teachers, administrators, or education specialists for higher education by providing support for institutes and short-term training programs.

This program provides support for in-service or pre-service part or full-time, up to 12 months duration; training of college personnel in a variety of academic fields, and other areas such as instructional methods and equipment, administrative skills, and student personnel services. Grants to the institution conducting the training cover all direct and indirect operating costs, and participant support.

Program Scope:

In FY 1973, most of the funds were awarded to three priority areas: (1) $2,013,662 (42.6%) supported programs to train junior college personnel; (2) $3,379,820 (71.5%) supported programs to train higher education personnel to serve minority and low-income students; and, (3) $2,014,192 (42.6%) supported programs to train personnel of developing institutions. These allocations to priority areas are **not**, however, mutually exclusive.

In FY 1974, no institutes were funded. Allocation of $1.57 million in FY 1975 is earmarked for approximately 40 institutes to be attended by approximately 2,350 persons.

Since FY 1969, the first year of the Part E program, there has been an increasing emphasis on programs for junior college personnel, personnel serving disadvantaged students and developing institutions, while there has been a deemphasis in support of teachers in non-developing four-year colleges and universities.

Program Effectiveness:

A 1972 study by Abt Associates gathered data on higher education personnel training needs from Presidents and five types of administrators at sixty 2 and 4-year colleges.

Information was collected from 3 sources: (1) a survey of 60 randomly selected undergraduate institutions; (2) a profiling system for synthesis and organization of EPDA V-E programs, and (3) a set of case studies, reflecting new trends in higher education.

Of the 1,734 participants who responded to the questionnaire, 403 (20%) were from minority background and 554 ([illegible]) were female. Over 90% of the respondents intended to pursue higher education careers. In general the institutes were highly rated by participants especially the special projects.

Institutional leaders for both the institute and fellowship programs reported the greatest need for training in human relations skills, followed by training in current special problems, people managment skills, academic studies and information management skills. The three activities highest in demand were developing goals and operating programs, activities relating to people of other races and cultures, and interviewing and one-to-one interactions. The major emphasis was on planning and interpersonal relations rather than on research.

While data are not available to assess the long-term impact of this program, it is evident that the EPDA Part E institutes program has focused on the national priorities which it was designed to meet.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No new evaluations are currently planned.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

A Study of the EPDA training programs was completed in February 1973, (Abt Associates, Inc. A Study of the Education Professions Development Act Training Programs for Higher Education Personnel. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation, 1973).

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

College Personnel Development, Fellowships for the Disadvantaged (CLEO)

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
HEA, 1965, Title IX, Part D, as amended	June 30, 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1973	$1,000,000	$ 0
	1974	1,000,000	750,000
	1975	1,000,000	750,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of Title IX, D is to provide fellowships to persons of ability from disadvantaged backgrounds, as determined by the Commissioner of Education, to undertake graduate or professional study. The Council on Legal Education Opportunity was established for the purpose of bringing about a significant increase in the number of lawyers from minority and disadvantaged groups. The CLEO Program, formerly operated by OEO, has been transferred to DHEW and the decision has been made to fund CLEO from the Title IX, Part D (section 961) authority. The FY 1974 appropriation was the first for the Program under OE direction.

The law authorizing this program places a $1,000,000 ceiling on expenditures for these fellowships. Expenditures cover a minimum stipend to each student of $1,000 per year plus the payment of the administrative costs of the national CLEO offices.

Program Scope:

In fiscal year 1974, OE funded 180 continuation fellowships and 210 new fellowships. In FY 1975, it is anticipated that approximately 266 new fellowships will be awarded.

Program Effectiveness:

It is still too soon to assess program impact in relation to the intended objectives.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations:

No studies planned.

Source of Evaluation Data:

None available.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

College Personnel Development, Allen J. Ellender Fellowships

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Education Amendments of 1972. Part C. Section 961 (a) (2). Public Law 92-506.	June 30, 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1973	$ 500,000	$ 500,000
1974	500,000	500,000
1975	500,000	500,000 (est.)

Program Purpose and Operation:

P. L. 92-506 authorizes the Commissioner of Education to make grants to the Close Up Foundation of Washington, D. C. to assist in carrying out a program of increasing the understanding of the Federal Government among secondary school students, their teachers, and the communities they represent. Up to 1,500 fellowships are awarded each year to economically disadvantaged secondary school students and to secodary school teachers.

Program Scope:

A total of 1,431 fellowships were awarded during fiscal year 1974, 604 to teachers and administrators and 827 to students representing 15 communities. The total amount awarded through December 30, 1974 was $467,115, resulting in an average of $326 per fellowship.

Program Effectiveness:

This program is still too new for measures of effectiveness to be available.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation:

None planned.

Source of Evaluation Data:

None available.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Veterans Cost-of-Instruction Program

Legislation:

Section 420 of the Higher Education Act of of 1965 as amended by Title X of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Public Law 92-318)

Expiration Date:

June 30, 1975 (Expenditures to be continued by institutions until June 30, 1976)

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1973	Unlimited	$25,000,000
1974	Unlimited	$23,750,000
1975	Unlimited	$23,750,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Veterans' Cost-of-Instruction Program is intended to provide improved and expanded services to veterans. An institution accepting a VCIP award is, in general, committed to spend at least 50% (75% of FY 1975 funds) of the funds to: (1) establish a full-time Office of Veterans' Affairs that is adequate, accessible, and visible; (2) employ at least one full-time staff member whose sole institutional responsibility is to veterans; and (3) provide services in the areas of recruitment, counseling, special education programs and outreach.

The remainder of the award not needed to provide required services may be used to defray expenses related to instruction in academically-related programs.

In order to be eligible for this program, institutions must have at least 25 veterans and (1) have 10% more veterans enrolled during the academic year of application than during the preceding academic year; or (2) at least 10% of the number of undergraduates must be eligible veterans.

Veterans must be participating in at least one of the following five programs in order for their institutions to qualify for Cost of Instruction payment on their behalf:

1. Vocational Rehabilitation Subsistence in Higher Education (Ch. 31 of Title 38);
2. Educational Assistance Program (Ch. 34 of Title 38);

3. Elementary and Secondary Educational Assistance--a remedial program to qualify the veteran for admission to a post-secondary institution (Section 1691, Subchapter V of Chapter 34 of Title 38);

4. Special Supplementary Education--an individualized tutorial assistance program (Section 1692, Subchapter V of Chapter 34 of Title 38).

5. Predischarge Education Program or PREP (Subchapter VI of Title 38).

Program Scope:

During FY 1974, 1,008 applications from institutions were approved which resulted in payments to institutions averaging $42 per veteran. During FY 1973, there were 1,057 approved applications and an average payment of $53 per veteran.

A maximum award of $135,000 per institution has been established by statute for the next funding cycle (FY 1976).

Program Effectiveness:

To date, no formal evaluation studies have been made. Anecdotal references and increased participation rates of veterans, however, do indicate more than a mere acceptance of this program.

An important ancillary effect of the Veterans' Cost-of-Instruction Program is the increased awareness of veterans of the availability of other grant and loan programs, Work-Study programs, the availability of part-time employment and tutorial and counseling services provided by both the veterans coordinator and the college counselor.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

As part of a projected study of the impact of federal student assistance programs on students and institutions, program application and fiscal operating reports from VCIP will be analyzed during FY 1976 to determine how well this program is meeting its legislative goals.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

None

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities

Legislation:

P.L. 89-329, Title VII-C of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1965; as amended by the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 (formerly Title III of the HEFA; P.L. 88-204).

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1964	$120,000,000	$ 0
1965	120,000,000	169,240,000
1966	120,000,000	110,000,000
1967	200,000,000	200,000,000
1968	400,000,000	0
1969	400,000,000	100,000,000
1970	400,000,000	0
1971	400,000,000	0
1972	50,000,000	0
1973	100,000,000	0
1974	150,000,000	0
1975	200,000,000	0

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to make loans to institutions of higher education and higher education building agencies to assist in the construction or improvement of undergraduate and graduate academic facilities.

The amount of a loan plus any other Federal funds may not exceed 80% of the eligible cost of a project. Loans are made after application approval. Not more than 12.5% of the total appropriation can go to any one state. Interest on these loans cannot exceed 3%.

Program Scope:

Since 1970, this program has not received any appropriations--as it has been replaced by the Annual Interest Grant program. However, the program has been authorized to make new loans to the extent that funds are made available by institutions of higher education withdrawing prior year approved loan commitments.

In FY 1972, 19 such loans totalling $11,074,000 were made to eighteen institutions. In FY 1973, no funds were provided for additional loans. In FY 1974, 12 institutions received loans totalling $10,183,000. In both FY 1972 and FY 1974, loans were targeted to predominantly black colleges.

Program Effectiveness:

Since the inception of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Federal government has provided financial assistance for the construction of academic facilities throughout the 54 states and territories. During the period fiscal year 1965 through fiscal year 1974, over $2.5 billion in direct Federal grants and loans were awarded. In addition, almost $1.5 billion in commercial loans were approved for annual interest subsidy support involving an annual commitment of Federal funds approximating $29 million. Over 1800 institutions of higher education received financial assistance for facilities construction and some 4,000 facilities costing in excess of $10 billion will have been constructed.

Findings found USOE evaluation study 1/ indicate that the total stock of space in 1974 approximated 1,332,300,000 net assignable square feet. Roughly 25% of this total was constructed between academic years 1968-69 and 1973-74. In addition, construction which will be completed by 1976 will supplement the total stock by an estimated 80,000,000 square feet. The study also found that nationally aggregated comparisons of space standards with the space available showed few shortages both for those categories where very specific space standards have been established (i.e., classrooms, laboratories, and office space) as well as for special use, general use, and support space; while nonacademic space shows some excess capacity. When disaggregated, the data show a tendency for some schools (particularly two-year private colleges) to be space-rich and for others (generally, public universities and public two-year colleges) to show some shortages as a consequence of shifts in enrollment patterns.

Considering the large amount of construction over the last 10 years, and the anticipated leveling off of enrollments, it appears that the objectives of the higher education facilities construction program have been met. While certain areas of the country may still face a shortage of academic space, the situation does not constitute a national problem.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1/ The Demand for Facilities in the Post-Secondary Sector, Joseph Froomkin, Inc., September 1974

Program Files, Division of Training and Facilities, Bureau of Post-Secondary Education.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Ethnic Heritage Studies Program

Legislation:

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title IX

Expiration Date:

September 30, 1978

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1974	$15,000,000	$2,375,000
1975	15,000,000	1,800,000

Program Purpose:

This program is designed to provide for a greater understanding of the contributions of one's own ethnic heritage and the ethnic heritage of others to increase intercultural understanding among the culturally diverse population of the United States. The program authorizes grants and contracts with public and private nonprofit educational agencies, institutions and organizations to assist them in planning, developing and operating ethnic heritage studies programs.

Programs for ethnic heritage studies which are proposed must be planned and carried out in consultation with an advisory committee that is representative of the ethnic group or groups with which the program is concerned. Project activities include curriculum material development, and distribution, teacher training, and cooperation with ethnic groups in the community served by each project. Emphasis will be placed on multi-ethnic endeavors that draw upon the cultural pluralism of the community.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

During FY 1974, a total of 42 projects were funded with an average award of $56,000.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Although there are no plans for formal evaluations of projects in the FY 1975 Evaluation Plan, each project carries within itself a built-in evaluation system in terms of constant review and professional criticism as well as feedback from teachers and students. These self-evaluations will then be summarized for FY 1974 and 1975.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Not applicable.

E. EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Teacher Corps Program

Legislation:

Part B-1 of the Education Professions Development Act (Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended (P.L. 89-329) as amended))

Expiration Date:

FY 1979

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$ 36,100,000	$ 9,500,000
1967	64,715,000	11,324,000
1968	33,000,000	13,500,000
1969	46,000,000	20,900,000
1970	80,000,000	21,737,000
1971	100,000,000	30,800,000
1972	100,000,000	37,435,000
1973	37,500,000	37,500,000
1974	37,500,000	37,500,000
1975	37,500,000	37,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purposes of the Teacher Corps are (1) to strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having high concentrations of low-income families, (2) to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher preparation and (3) to encourage institutions of higher education and local educational agencies to improve programs of training and retraining for teachers and teacher aides. To achieve this, the Teacher Corps attracts and trains college graduates and upperclassmen to serve in teams under experienced teachers; attracts volunteers to serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants; attracts and trains educational personnel to provide specialized training for juvenile delinquents, youth offenders, and adult criminal offenders; and supports demonstration projects for retraining experienced teachers and teacher aides serving in local educational agencies. Typical participant activities involve academic work in a college or university, on the job training in schools, and participation in school related community projects. Typical program elements include flexible models of teacher education based on performance criteria, involvement with other college and university departments outside the school of education, granting credit for the internship period, and utilization of regular school staff and members of the community in the teaching staff.

Program Scope:

During Fiscal Year 1974 the Teacher Corps had 94 projects. These projects operated in 158 school districts and in 93 institutions of higher education for a total of 251. Of the 251, 111 were continuing and 140 were new starts. The total participant level remained relatively the same as was for the previous fiscal year (4500). Projects, through differentiated staffing and individualized instructional activities, directly affected the learning experiences of approximately 125,000 children of whom 47,700 (37.8) were from families with incomes below $3,000. Approximately 80 percent of these children were from elementary schools. Teacher Corps projects impacted on special clientele groups such as bilingual children (69 projects), Indian children (67 projects), and children in training institutions (16 projects). Teacher Corps also ran a special program which encouraged high school and college students, parents and other community residents to serve as tutors or instructional assistants for children in disadvantaged areas.

Program Effectiveness:

A number of evaluation studies provide information and insight about program operation. For example, a survey of June, 1972 Teacher Corps graduates was conducted by Teacher Corps in August, 1972. Seventy percent, or 900 of 1300 graduates responded. About 570, or 63 percent, indicated that they would remain in the field of education with 27% (240) of this group teaching in the school district where they served as interns. Ten percent (90) of the interns had not found teaching positions at the time of the survey.

In addition, the Comptroller General's Office issued a report to the Congress in July, 1972, concerning the assessment of the Teacher Corps program made by the General Accounting Office (GAO). The study consisted of a review of Teacher Corps projects at seven institutions of higher education and the respective participating local education agencies. Also, a questionnaire was sent to all Corps members in the Nation who had completed their internships in 1968 and 1969. A total of 550 responded to the questionnaire. The findings and conclusions are grouped according to the two major program purposes as follows:

1. Strengthening educational opportunities

The GAO found that the program strengthened the educational opportunities for children of low-income families who attended schools where Corps members were assigned. Corps members provided more individualized instruction, used new teaching methods, and expanded classroom and extracurricular activities. Most of the interns and team leaders believed that children in the schools served by the program had benefited from it. The classroom assistance provided by interns made it possible for regular teachers to devote more time to individualized instruction and make classes more relevant to the needs of the children.

Some of the Teacher Corps approaches to educating children were continued by the school districts after corps members completed their assignments. Other approaches were discontinued because the school districts either had not determined their usefulness or did not have sufficient staff and financial resources to carry them on. Corps members generally became involved with various types of educational community activities which most Corps members believe had been of benefit to both children and adults. Some believed, however, that the activities were of little or no benefit due to poor planning and lack of community support. A majority of the interns who graduated from the program remained in the field of education. Most of these interns took teaching positions in schools serving low-income areas.

2. Broadening teacher-training program

The GAO study indicates that the program had some success in broadening teacher preparation programs at institutions of higher education. All seven institutions made some changes in their regular teacher preparation program as a result of the Teacher Corps. Five institutions developed a special curriculum for the Teacher Corps; the other two used existing courses. Most interns believed that their academic coursework was relevant to their needs. The impact of the program was lessened, however, because much of the special curriculum was not made available to non-Teacher Corps students and because institutions had not identified teaching approaches and techniques that would warrant inclusion in their regular teacher preparation programs. The institutions that used existing courses for Teacher Corps students did not determine the effectiveness of these courses in preparing Corps members to teach disadvantaged children.

Another relevant study is the Resource Management Corporation evaluation of Teacher Corps during FY 72. This evaluation covered 70 projects having 2,490 interns. Sixty-three projects with approximately 1900 interns responded to the survey instruments. The major conclusion drawn from this study was that while the Teacher Corps projects had performed fairly well in terms of operating within program guidelines, there were some areas that stood out as meriting attention by program specialists. The academic training offered to interns, for example, was much more inflexible than desired by the program staff. Only 31 percent of the total course-work was open for negotiation by interns, with 69 percent required by the college or project. This finding is considerably different from the 50-50 balance established as a program goal. In addition, interns perceived a lack of communication among groups within a project and cited this as the major problem area for the program.

A further area of concern was in the level of involvement of many advisory councils and of the community in general in project operations. One example was that in 26 projects advisory councils met quarterly or semi-annually. Finally, considerably more projects emphasized change in college training programs as opposed to change in the school systems.

At least one analysis of a particular project -- the Louisville, Kentucky Cycle V Project -- offers further useful insight into program operations and accomplishments. The major thrust of this project was to strengthen educational opportunities in inner-city schools by training 100 Teacher Corps interns to become working partners on facilitating teams. These interns were an integral part of a ten-member teaching team employing humanistic learning processes, relevant curriculum and flexible educational structures. The teaching staffs of six elementary schools were reassigned as necessary so that these schools could be completely restructured around

3 to 6 teaching teams each composed of one experienced coordinating teacher (team leader), another experienced teacher (staff teacher), four Teacher Corps interns, two paraprofessionals, and student teachers when available. Each team instructed approximately 100 children in an open learning environment.

During the first year of the Cycle V Teacher Corps project, only 17% of the elementary classes (grades 2-6) in project schools had an increase of 0.7 year or more in the total reading achievement mean. But, in the second year of the project this percentage had more than tripled to 54% of the classes (grades) having an increase of 0.7 year or more. The percentage indicating a year or more of growth advanced from only 4% to 18%.

Other advantages resulting either totally or partially from Cycle V Teacher Corps include:

1. A lowered pupil-teacher ratio by using differentiated staffing.
2. More creativity and innovation in the schools due to the wide range of backgrounds of Corpsmen.
3. Decreased vandalism and increased school attendance.
4. Communication improved at all levels of instruction.
5. Increased individualization of instruction.
6. Improved pupil attitude toward school and self-concepts according to pre- and post-test data.
7. Increased special programs for children with special needs, e.g., behavior modification classes, enrichment programs, tutorial and remedial classes.
8. Involvement of parents in making curriculum decisions.
9. Training of teachers to use behavioral objectives.
10. Increased counseling services for pupils.
11. An expanding behavior modification program (Swinging Door) initiated by Cycle V interns to encourage students to remain in the School System.
12. Development of a 10-year plan for spreading team teaching and differentiated staffing in the District.
13. Neighborhood School Boards as an integral part of local school decision-making.
14. Closer communication and cooperation between universities and the School District.

15. Establishment of cross-age tutoring.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

A major new study of the impact and effectiveness of Teacher Corps was begun in July, 1972. This was a two phase comprehensive study which concentrated attention and evaluation on measurement of program performance in terms of the ultimate student performance goal. The study focused on assessment and analysis of the impact of the program as measured by three major dimensions -- institutional change, enhanced teaching skills and behaviors, and improved classroom learning by students taught by Teacher Corps interns and graduates. Twenty 6th cycle elementary school projects participated in the study. Phase I of the study was completed in June 1974. Phase II was completed in December 1974.

The objective of Phase I of the study was to identify and analyze those combinations of intern background characteristics and training program characteristics that are related to desired teaching skills and attitudes of interns at the end of their training (exit characteristics). Data were collected at 20 Sixth Cycle Teacher Corps projects. The 20 projects represent all of those that prepared interns as elementary school teachers during the period 1971-1975. Data about the training program at each site were obtained by interviews with and completed questionnaires from eleven role groups involved in each project, e.g., team leaders, school principals, school superintendents, higher education personnel, etc. Data about intern teaching characteristics were obtained from a 50 percent stratified random sample of interns (sample N=369). All data about the training programs for interns and the teaching characteristics of interns were gathered in the spring of their second year of teaching. No comparisons were made with comparable groups of teachers in non-Teacher Corps training programs.

Information about the teaching characteristics of interns was gathered in several ways. Each intern was observed three times by an individual trained in the use of classroom observation instruments. To complement the classroom observations, each intern completed a log of his/her professional activities over one week's time. An interview with the intern about activities in the log provided information on how interns prepared lessons, diagnosed pupil needs, and evaluated pupil performance. Additional information was gathered from interns and their team leader by means of several questionnaires.

The conclusions drawn from Phase I of this study are:

1. Background characteristics, and training program characteristics were not good predictors of an intern's exit teaching skills and attitudes:

2. To the extent that intern background characteristics and Teacher Corps training program characteristics are related to intern exit teaching skills and attitudes, it is the Teacher Corps training

program rather than an intern's background characteristics that are most closely associated with his exit teaching skills and attitudes;

3. The training program characteristics most closely associated with intern exit teaching skills and attitudes are:

    a. the pattern of collaborative decision making;

    b. the degree of program integration, e.g., follow-up of course-work in public school setting;

    c. the degree of personalization of the program for interns; and

    d. the community component for interns.

4. The extent that teacher competencies were specified and used by the project was not closely related to any intern exit teaching skill. Other aspects of competency-based teacher education, however, were among the best predictors of intern exit teaching skills. These aspects include collaborative decision making and the personalization of the program for interns; and

5. For Black, Chicano, or White interns studied separately, there were discernible patterns of relationship between intern background characteristics, Teacher Corps training program characteristics, and intern exit teaching skills and attitudes. For example, the community component of the training program for Chicano and White interns was directly related to the ability of these interns to communicate effectively with pupils. Such a relationship did not hold for Black interns.

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual operational data collected by the Teacher Corps Program.

2. United States Office of Education telephone survey of Teacher Corps graduates who completed programs in June, 1972.

3. Assessment of the Teacher Corps Program -- Report to the Congress by The Comptroller General of the United States, July 14, 1972.

4. Full-Scale Implementation of a Process Evaluation System for Programs of the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems (formerly BEPD) by Resource Management Corporation, December 1, 1972.

5. Louisville, Kentucky Cycle V. Teacher Corps Project -- A Process Evaluation, June, 1971.

6. A Study of Teacher Training At Sixth Cycle Teacher Corps Projects by Pacific Training and Technical Assistance, Berkeley, January, 1974.

7. *Reform and Organizational Survival: The Teacher Corps as an Instrument of Educational Change* by Ronald G. Corwin. John Wiley and Sons, 1973.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Career Opportunities Program

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
P.L. 90-35, 1967, Part D, Section 531 Education Professions Development Act	FY 1976

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	$ 90,000,000 (All of Part D)	$ 22,117,000
	1971	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	25,987,000
	1972	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	26,163,000
	1973	(Total EPDA - $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D)	24,955,000
	1974	(Total EPDA - $300,000,000)	22,394,000
	1975	(Total EPDA - $450,000,000)	1,784,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

The purpose of the Career Opportunities Program (COP) is to improve the education of children from low-income families by:

1. Attracting low-income persons -- including Vietnam veterans -- to new careers in schools serving people from low-income families;
2. Finding better ways of utilizing school staffs for services;
3. Developing training programs for school aide personnel leading to full certification as teachers which combine college level work study and structured career advancement opportunities;
4. Encouraging greater understanding and participation between the community and the education system; and

5. Increasing cooperative relationships between related programs, agencies, and institutions.

Awards are made to local education agencies, which design training programs jointly with community organizations and agencies, community colleges, and nearby universities, and with their State education agencies. The schools subcontract with cooperating institutions of higher education to provide training services. State education agencies and institutions of higher education may also apply for awards. Projects must be located in schools with high concentrations of low-income families.

The Career Opportunities Program encourages low-income men and women to start their careers as education auxiliaries at whatever level their abilities and interests permit, then follow a career ladder to more responsible, more remunerative and more challenging jobs in low-income area schools.

Career Opportunities help school districts and universities create programs that are more relevant to the needs of low-income people and to the career training needs of the participants themselves. Training combines academic study towards high school equivalency, the associate of arts and the baccalaureate degrees, with classroom work in low-income area schools supervised by experienced teachers, who serve as team leaders and cooperating teachers. A combination of courses and practicum enable participants to earn 30 credits per calendar year.

Program Scope:

The Fiscal Year 1974 funds will be expended in academic year 1974-75 to continue all 132 COP projects. Fiscal Year 1973 was the first year of administration of the COP program by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regional offices. Staff training for both regional and central staff was completed last year.

Every COP project has both informal and formal linkages with other government agencies and programs such as Housing and Urban Development, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Right-to-Read Programs.

There are currently 7,500 COP participants. Preliminary information on some of these participants indicates the following:

-- There are 960 participants who are Vietnam veterans.

-- There are 611 participants specializing in special education.

-- There are 363 participants who are native Americans.

-- There are an estimated 55% Black, 11% Chicano, 4% Puerto Rican, 4% Indian, 25% White and 1% other participants.

-- There are 160 COP aides working as supervisors of Youth Tutoring Youth.

In addition, to date approximately 1,500 COP participants have graduated. Data is available pertaining to over one third of the graduates -- of these -- (68%) have been employed by the local education agency in which they were aides and (24%) are employed by other school systems or are in graduate school.

Program Effectiveness:

A national impact evaluation of COP was conducted by Abt and Associates, Inc. in FY 72. The findings show that the Program is successful when measured in accordance with the following factors:

(1) COP aides are representative of the targeted program population. They show strong motivation to continue in the Program and become teachers, and have a positive professional view of themselves. As such, the Program has provided a vehicle for upward mobility for the aides.

(2) Satisfaction with the Program is high among superintendents, principals, teachers and COP aides.

(3) Principals want more COP aides in their classrooms and feel that they increase the amount of individual instruction scheduled for children. They perceive COP aides as more professional than other teacher aides.

(4) Superintendents see the COP aides as linkages between their schools and community groups. They want more aides for both regular classes and for special students. There is some evidence supporting less restrictive requirements in the hiring of teachers when COP is in the school system.

(5) Institutions of higher education report changes in course content, schedules, and entrance requirements not only to accommodate COP but also as a result of their COP experiences. These changes, present, planned, or being considered for all students were in the direction of performance-based teacher education.

(6) State Education Agencies show a positive relationship between the presence of COP in their schools and changes in credentialing requirements.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There is not yet any evidence showing positive impact on student academic performance and attitudes. Queens College is currently conducting an evaluation effort to seek evidence pertaining to this dimension of the program's effectiveness. In addition, studies of differences in classroom climate and student interaction are underway at Bank Street College of Education.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Program operational and fiscal data collected by COP.
2. Impact Evaluation of the Career Opportunities Program by Abt and Associates, Inc., January 1, 1973.
3. COP Project, Richmond, California Unified School District.
4. Project COP, Division of Research, Memphis City Schools Memphis, Tennessee.
5. Information gained from the ACE (Analysis of Communication in Education) and BRACE (Behavior Ratings and Analysis of Communication in Education) instruments by Bank Street College of Education (In progress).
6. Research foundation at Queens College, New Careers Training Laboratory (In progress).

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Exceptional Children (formerly Special Education)

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
P.L. 90-35, 1967, Parts C, D, and F Education Professions Development Act	FY 1976

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1970	$ 90,000,000 (All of Part D)	$ 6,992,000
	1971	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	6,655,000
	1972	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	5,483,000
	1973	(Total EPDA - $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D)	4,214,897
	1974	(Total EPDA - $300,000,000)	3,907,000
	1975	(Total EPDA - $450,000,000)	-0-

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program trains educational leaders, regular classroom teachers and other educational personnel to deal effectively with exceptional children who are in regular, rather than special, classrooms. The need for this training is based on two factors: (1) there is a shortage of specially-trained teachers; and (2) there is a growing trend toward moving children who are physically handicapped or have other learning difficulties into the mainstream of regular classrooms where teachers are generally not equipped to meet their needs. This program, therefore, concentrates on:

a) training inservice regular classroom personnel to identify children with potential or current handicapping conditions and to diagnose, prescribe, and implement an educational program for such children; and training educational leaders to facilitate such training programs.

b) developing training and protocol materials necessary to implement such a training program.

c) providing developmental assistance to local and State educational agencies and institutions of higher education to help them develop training for educational personnel to work with exceptional children.

Grants are made to institutions of higher education and State and local education agencies.

Program Scope:

Approximately 6,000 persons in 21 projects are participating in innovative training programs for the preparation of leadership personnel in teaching exceptional children. Approximately 30 percent of the participants are non-whites representing Blacks, Chicanos and American-Indians.

Recent court decisions (e.g., District of Columbia, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, California) have mandated the integration of exceptional children into regular classrooms. This trend is growing and there is a proliferation of similar cases pending. The need, therefore, for existing regular classroom teachers to receive training which will enable them to meet the needs of these children with special problems, is greater than ever. One project has been supported to produce training materials for use by other Office of Education projects (e.g., Bureau of Education of the Handicapped and Teacher Corps). In addition, three field-based developmental assistance centers have been funded and focus upon educational leaders, trainers of teachers, and experienced educational personnel. Every effort has been made, with limited funds, to provide assistance to those States and school districts undergoing change as a result of court decisions or legislative mandate.

During the six years this program has been in existence, approximately 15,000 minority people in leadership positions have been participants in these programs. Most projects have been in low-income areas where the incidence of handicapping conditions has been greatest. This has permitted work to proceed directly with the people most affected.

Program Effectiveness:

In 1972, the Resource Management Corporation conducted a process evaluation of 39 projects. The overall conclusion of this study is that the major goal of the Special Education Program -- the training of teachers to teach handicapped children in regular classroom settings -- is being met by most of the projects studied. Academic and practicum training are directed to this end, emphasizing identification, diagnosis, and remediation for handicapped children. No major problem areas were cited by participants and there were no frequently mentioned suggestions for project improvement. Self-evaluation of projects is well underway, with most projects having established measurable objectives for the evaluation.

On-going and Planned Evaluation Studies:

No projected studies are currently planned for this area. There are no major studies underway; nevertheless, each project is required to have an internal evaluation component.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual site visits
2. Annual review by the University of Minnesota Leadership Training Institute
3. Quarterly and yearly reports.
4. Review of 1971-72 projects by the University of Minnesota Leadership Training Institute.
5. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Education Personnel Development, December 1972 by Resource Management Corporation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Urban/Rural School Development Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-35, 1967 Part D, Section 531
Education Professions Development Act

Expiration Date:

FY 1976

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	(Obligated) Appropriation
1971	$ 90,000,000 (All of Part D)	$10,527,000
1972	90,000,000 (All of Part D)	11,989,000
1973	(Total EPDA - $200,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D)	10,297,640
1974	(Total EPDA - $300,000,000)	9,529,000
1975	(Total EPDA - $450,000,000 not less than 5% of which is for Part D)	6,355,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

The Urban/Rural School Development Program is designed to bring about enriched learning opportunities for students in schools serving a high concentration of low-income families. Its basic purpose is to produce -- (over the life of a five-year project) -- accelerated classroom academic achievement, improved affective development, and increased range of opportunities for students. Through a strategy of close school-community collaboration, the program concentrates on the following intermediate objectives:

1. To make training for educational personnel more responsive to the needs of the school, its staff, its pupil population, and the community by means of concentrating training and program development resources in a single school or in a limited number of related schools;
2. To develop improved decision-making capabilities in school and community personnel;
3. To develop within the school and community a continuous process for identifying critical needs and assembling ideas, resources, and strategies to meet those needs; and

4. To effect a process through which the individual school and its community accepts responsibility for its decisions, and is accountable for its actions regarding the utilization of resources, formulation of strategies and development of a program to improve pupil performance.

Local education agencies are the usual grantees. SEA's and IHE's can also apply.

Educational personnel normally employed in participating schools (teachers, paraprofessionals, counselors, principals, etc.) receive training, and implement curricular and organizational reforms.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

There are 32 current projects involving about 4,500 school staff and community members. Funds appropriated in Fiscal Year 1973, and expended during academic year 1973-74 provided for continued developmental assistance to each of these sites for the difficult and sensitive process of maintaining viable school-community councils and implementing training programs based upon local needs assessment activities.

Expenditure of Fiscal Year 1974 funds vary according to the scope and size of the various models. All school-community councils have developed and implemented intensive training for staff and council members. Evaluation and on-site developmental assistance has been intensified to aid management and staff members as they moved into more comprehensive staff training systems. Academic year 1974-75 will be the third operational year in a projected five-year operational program of support to 32 sites.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

All projects are currently engaged in evaluation activities, however, it is unlikely that a reliable impact evaluation of the program's effect upon children's learning and behavior will be available despite earlier optimism on this score. Attempts to relate children's learning directly to training components has proved to be much more difficult and elusive than had been originally thought. The local project evaluations will continue to seek such data, but it is recognized that the necessary controls are almost impossible to achieve in practical application. In addition training is being provided at each site to strengthen existing evaluation designs and practices.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program operations data.
2. National and Regional Conferences.
3. Reports from LTI Regional Coordinators.
4. Program officer site visits.

5. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, December 1, 1972 by the Resource Management Corporation.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Vocational Education Personnel Development Program

Legislation:

P.L. 90-575 1968, Education Professions Development Act, Part F, Sec. S552 & 553

Expiration Date:

FY 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1970	$35,000,000(Part F)	$ 5,698,000
1971	40,000,000	6,900,000
1972	45,000,000	6,900,000
1973	(Not less than 10% of $200,000,000 Total EPDA)	
1974	(Not less than 10% of $300,000,000 Total EPDA)	11,268,000
1975	(Not less than 10% of $450,000,000 Total EPDA)	9,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The goal of the Vocational Education Personnel Development Program is to provide institutions of higher education, State and local vocational education leaders with the capability for developing a systems approach to professional vocational personnel development which is responsive to local needs and which will effect improved preparation of vocational education personnel. The enabling objectives are 1) to initiate cooperative arrangements between State and local education agencies to insure the adequate preparation and developing of professional personnel for vocational education; 2) to improve the quality and effectiveness of the instruction and administration of existing career and vocational programs; and 3) to continue support for the revision and refinement of the States systems for professional personnel development in career and vocational education.

The Vocational Education State Systems Program provides opportunities for State boards for vocational education and institutions of higher education to train and retrain experienced vocational education personnel and other personnel in order to strengthen vocational education programs and the administration of schools offering these programs. This is accomplished through grants that are awarded to 56 State boards including territories.

The Vocational Education Leadership Development Program, which grants awards to institutions of higher education for the development of new and innovative programs at the leadership level, has been the second component of the Vocational Personnel Development Program. The doctoral component of this program with 216 participants was phased out in FY 1973. In addition, 256 participants benefited from a one-year leadership program.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

1. Fifty-six State Boards including Puerto Rico, Samoa and the Trust territories have now designed and implemented a plan for the development of vocational education personnel.

2. Each State agency has established at the State-level a specific unit with responsibility for determining professional personnel needs on a Statewide basis; for planning, coordinating and funding programs to meet those needs; and for monitoring and maintaining a continuous assessment and evaluation of the State system for Vocational education personnel development.

3. Approximately 344 different project activities involving approximately 54,000 participants from all service areas have been supported with a resulting reduction of fragmentation in the field and a more comprehensive approach to teacher education and local program operation.

4. The 56 State Boards are now making special efforts to bring State and local education agencies and institutions of higher education together for a more coordinated and concerted effort in developing and expanding vocational education to meet the needs of each State.

5. There have been approximately 60 projects conducted for in-service training in management by objectives for all of their State-staff plus some local administrative personnel.

6. Approximately 25 States are re-evaluating their certification requirements for vocational education personnel and are beginning to relate them to competency-based criteria.

7. For FY 1974 there were 14 training activities focused on regionally determined needs and 13 on national priorities. Training activities included: (1) increasing participation and improving the role of ethnic and racial minorities; (2) development of training strategies for high-level educational decision makers who affect vocational education programs; (3) training 30 health occupation teachers in construction of competency based modules and synthesizing guidelines; and (4) training 50 vocational guidance personnel through exploratory experiences in business and industry in order to emphasize the integration of career education into the curriculum.

8. Twenty-eight universities received assistance in implementing comprehensive leadership development programs at the graduate level to supply high-level leadership personnel for vocational education. Federal funding level for this program was $1.9 million. Commencing in September 1973, one-year leadership development programs were initiated in 18 institutions. There were 342 participants enrolled at a funding level of $3.0 million. During FY 74 $3.0 million were provided to support 347 awardee's at 28 institutions.

9. For activities supported through the States during FY 71 and subsequent years, their approximate percentages of total funding for each category include: (1) in-service programs for increasing the competencies of teachers, administrators, and support personnel (51%); training in-service teachers to work with disadvantaged and handicapped youth (21%); exchange of education-industrial personnel (3%); developing teachers for career education (6%); and recruitment and training of teachers from other fields for vocational education (19%).

10. Approximately 15 States supported projects supporting the development of counseling and guidance personnel with occupational awareness and knowledge of the utilization of occupational information for placement.

Emphasis has been placed on the development, implementation, and improvement of comprehensive, statewide systems for vocational education. Special efforts were made during FY 73 to upgrade vocational education personnel training in institutions of higher education. Under Section 553 of the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA), State systems received grants of a minimum of $34,000, with larger States receiving commensurately higher amounts proportionate to their unmet needs. These programs were substantially directed to support a major focus in improving the quality of ongoing and projected vocational educational programs. The fellowship program under Section 552 of the Education Professions Development Act has been broadened to include a wide array of leadership development activities. The present program is continued with an emphasis on the midmanagement level. The program stresses increasing leadership capabilities in local education agencies, State departments of education, institutions of higher education and related agencies to enable them to provide for development and coordination education personnel development at all educational levels.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Ohio State University is continuing the development of an evaluation system for vocational education leadership and development activities for all State programs. The system is flexible enough to adapt the evaluation needs of each State and has been piloted in Tennessee and California so far. After completion of this developmental effort it is anticipated that training of State leadership will be conducted in the interests of implementing the model.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Annual program operations data.

2. Process Evaluation of the Programs of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, December 1972 by Resource Management Corporation.

3. An Evaluation System for Vocational E[illegible] Leadership and Professional Development Acti[illegible]lo State University.

4. Hamilton, Phyllis. "Report on the Vocational Education Professions." The 1974 Commissioner's Report on the Education Professions, Stanford Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA. (includes case studies of eleven State Boards funded under the 553 program in Fiscal Years 1970 through 1974 including a 552 funded university in each State) to be published in November, 1974.

F. LIBRARY PROGRAMS

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Library Services

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Library Services and Construction Act, Title I, as amended by P.L. 91-600 (and Title IV-A and IV-B to 1972)and further amended by P.L. 93-380)	FY 1976

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
Beginning in 1972, State Institutionalized Services (Title IV-A) and Services to the Physically Handicapped (Title IV-B) were combined under Title I.	1965	$ 25,000,000	$ 25,000,000
	1966	25,000,000	25,000,000
	1967	35,000,000	35,000,000
	1968	45,000,000	35,000,000
	1969	55,000,000	35,000,000
	1970	65,000,000	29,750,000
	1971	75,000,000	35,000,000
	1972	112,000,000	46,000,000
	1973	117,000,000	62,000,000 1/
	1974	123,500,000	44,155,000
(Old Title IV-A)	1975	129,675,000	49,155,000 2/
	1967	5,000,000	350,000
	1968	7,500,000	2,120,000
	1969	10,000,000	2,094,000
	1970	12,500,000	2,094,000
	1971	15,000,000	2,094,000
	1972	See above	See above

1/ $32,000,000 of the 1973 appropriation was impounded and not released until FY 1974.

2/ Amount to be released uncertain.

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
(Old Title IV-B)			
	1967	$ 3,000,000	$ 250,000
	1968	4,000,000	1,320,000
	1969	5,000,000	1,334,000
	1970	6,000,000	1,334,000
	1971	7,000,000	1,334,000
	1972	See above	See above

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides support to States through basic and matching formula grants to assist them in providing library services to areas without such services or areas with inadequate services; to assist in improving quality of information services, including services to specialized groups such as the disadvantaged, bilingual, the physically handicapped, and those in State public institutions; to strengthen public library administration at the State level; to strengthen metropolitan public libraries which serve as national or regional resource centers; and to plan programs and projects to extend and improve services.

The Federal share ranges from 33% to 66%, except for the Trust territories, which is 100% Federally funded. States must match in proportion to their per capital income. They must maintain the same level of fiscal effort for handicapped and institutionalized library service that existed prior to the combination of these programs under the new amendments (FY 1971 level).

Program Scope:

General data for this program are as follows:

	1974 Estimated
1. Population with access to LSCA services (in thousands)	87,000
2. Disadvantaged persons with access to LSCA (in thousands)	28,000
3. Number of State institutionalized persons served by LSCA	800,000
4. Number of handicapped persons served by LSCA	400,000
5. Number of Right-to-Read projects supported by LSCA	73

6.	Number of Drug Abuse projects supported by LSCA	115
7.	Number of Environmental Education projects supported by LSCA	69

Program Effectiveness:

The first study of the impact of Title I services, covering the period from 1964 to 1968, was made by the Systems Development Corporation. In reviewing the LSCA activities in 11 States it found that most projects felt handicapped by lack of manpower; lack of coordination among public libraries and other educational agencies; need for research in determining whether "disadvantaged projects" were reaching their goals; lack of understanding of the public library's potential and actual services; lack of ability of libraries to react quickly to public demands for more services; and lack of suitable measurements of library performances.

The Behavioral Science Corporation study identified, visited, and evaluated public library service programs for the disadvantaged, in selected cities. These projects were not limited, however, to Title I projects. This pilot study of 15 local library projects for the urban disadvantaged, utilizing user and non-user interviews for evaluation, recommended that libraries find better ways to coordinate with schools when dealing with disadvantaged children. The successful programs were characterized by the inclusion of some or all of the following: active participation by the target group; emphasis on audio-visual rather than print materials; and the fact that the program had been viewed as a significant service by the adults in the community.

Systems Development Corporation conducted a major evaluation study to determine how the Library Service and Construction Act, Titles I & II is meeting the public library needs of special clientele groups, e.g., disadvantaged, ethnic minorities, handicapped, and institutionalized persons. The project has surveyed all State Library Agencies, all known ongoing projects directed toward these groups, and discontinued projects. Fifty-five representative sites were field visited and library and related agency personnel were interviewed, as well as library users and non-users. This study provides an inventory of projects, a needs assessment, and recommendations for change. Over 1600 projects were identified and queried. It was found that many projects classified as discontinued (due to the loss of LSCA funding) were operational, and being funded by State or local monies. A methodology specifying criteria to adjudge program effectiveness was developed, and was tested and validated with the examined projects.

The report stated:

> "It is evident from the data gathered in this project that LSCA projects directed toward special clienteles have been successful, to some extent. More projects are successful than unsucessful, and fairly significant numbers of special clientele groups have been reached. It is also evident that some projects are far from successful. Many important needs are not being met, or are barely being met, even by projects judged successful...
>
> In many States it was evident that were Federal funds not available, there would be no projects whatsoever for special clienteles. Indeed, in one State plan it was stated that, while there were special clienteles in the State, no projects need be directed towards them because the State intended to give service to all of its citizens on an equal basis. That naive attitude represents -- all too frequently -- the lack of knowledge and concern that exists at many levels of State and local government. Library services for special clienteles do not hold the same attitudes as the traditional, we-await-the-knowledgeable-user, services. Special clienteles frequently need to be educated to become users, and to be persuaded that the library has something of value for them. LSCA funds have been a critical factor in projects for special clienteles, and they have provided the bulk of the funds used for innovative projects; without LSCA (or a real substitute) there would be little or no innovation -- in short, a rather static, even moribund public library in the U.S."

A major study of "The Public Library and Federal Policy" was performed by SDC. This study assessed the current total national public library situation utilizing existing data and included recommendations for further data collection efforts in areas of current information deficiencies.

The final report stated.

> "In this study we examined the past and present status of the public library and likely directions for the future. Based upon our examination of the public library as an information-providing institution, and our certainty that free access to all kinds of information is a requirement of a democratic society and a necessity for individual well being, we have recommended certain courses of action for the Federal government...
>
> Two major directions for library development have emerged from the current study. The first is toward greater efficiency. This can be accomplished through system organization, which will allow centralization of certain functions, through improved internal management and organization, and through staff training.

The second direction is toward greater specialization and differentiation of services among public libraries. This can be accomplished through organization of public libraries with all other kinds of libraries and through cooperation between public libraries and non-library agencies for the purpose of providing special educational services.

The Federal government has played a role in recent years of helping the public library to organize into systems and to provide services to segments of the population who were previously unserved. While there are indications that Federal programs suffered from insufficient coordination, insufficient evaluation, and inadequate funding, there is much evidence to demonstrate that a strong impetus toward system organization and the availability of services to special clienteles was provided by Federal intervention.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no ongoing evaluation studies directly related to this program. No further evaluation studies in this area are planned.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Overview of LSCA Title I, by System Development Corporation, published by Bowker, 1968.
2. A Study of Public Library Service to the Disadvantaged in Selected Cities, by Claire Lipsman and contracted to Behavior Science Corporation, 1970.
3. Study of Exemplary Public Library Reading and Reading Related Programs for Children, Youth and Adults, by Barss, Reitzel & Assoc. Inc., 1972.
4. Evaluation of LSCA Services to Special Target Groups, by System Development Corporation, July 1973.
5. The Public Library and Federal Policy by System Development Corporation, Final Report, April 1973.

6. Basic Issues in the Governmental Financing of Public Library Services, Government Studies and Systems, May 1973.

7. Various Library Demonstration Projects: These projects are designed to survey and analyze the public library and information services to the American Indian, the aging, and the information needs of the rural and urban poor.

8. Program Operational Data.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Public Library Construction

Legislation: | **Expiration Date:**

Library Services and Construction Act, Title II, as amended by P.L. 91-600 | FY 1976

FUNDING HISTORY:	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965	$ 30,000,000	$ 30,000,000
	1966	30,000,000	30,000,000
	1967	40,000,000	40,000,000
	1968	50,000,00	21,185,000
	1969	60,000,000	9,185,000
	1970	70,000,000	7,807,250
	1971	80,000,000	7,092,500
	1972	80,000,000	9,500,000
	1973	84,000,000	15,000,000
	1974	88,000,000	-0- 1/
	1975	92,500,000	0

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides funds to States on a matching basis to support the construction of public libraries. Funds may be used for the construction of new building, for additions to existing building and for renovation or alteration of existing buildings or for the acquisition of an existing facility to be used for public library purposes. Grants are made to States on a formula basis. The Federal share ranges from 33% to 66%, except for the Trust Territory which is 100% Federally funded. States must match in proportion to their per capita income.

Program Scope:

From the program's inception in 1965 through 1974, 1980 projects totaling $170,000,000 have been supported, adding more than 21 million square feet of floor space. State and local agencies will have contributed approxi- $480,000,000 in support of these projects. In addition to above identified funds, General Revenue Sharing provided $965,920; Appalachia Regional Development Act, $882,640; Model Cities, $250,000; Public Works and Economic Development Act, $127,267. About 1.2 million square feet of new

---

1/ $15 million was available as a carryover from FY 1973 impounded funds.

or renovated public library floor space was added in 1974 with the $10,786,985 FY 73 funds released in FY 1974.

Program Effectiveness:

A recently completed study "Evaluation of LSCA Services to Special Target Groups," in a section entitled "Factors Associated With Program Success" identified facilities as one of several important factors for program success. The report states:

> "The second important factor in project success seems to be appropriate facilities. It seemed that projects that might otherwise have made a significant impact did not do so, in some cases, because the project lacked separate facilities that could be identified as project facilities by the target group. Lack of identifiable project facilities is not always bad, since some successful projects were found using branch library facilities. However, the existing branches in these cases almost always had both a flexible interior and a flexible director, and project activities that were apparent to the target groups, even though carried out within the normal facilities. Even if project facilities are sometimes located in what seem to be makeshift and unsuitable quarters, the fact that they are separate and identifiable makes for success in spite of their temporary, crowded, or otherwise negative aspects. In general, then, the target groups must be able to "identify" the project facilities in some way.

This would suggest that the additional library space has met a critical need.

Ongoing and Planned:

There are no ongoing or planned evaluation studies directly related to this program.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Evaluation of Library Services and Construction Act Services to Specialized Target Groups, by System Development Corporation, July 1973.

2. Program Operational Data.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Interlibrary Cooperative Services

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Library Services and Construction Act, Title III, as amended by P.L. 91-600	FY 1976

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1967	$ 5,000,000	$ 375,000
	1968	7,500,000	2,375,000
	1969	10,000,000	2,281,000
	1970	12,500,000	2,281,000
	1971	15,000,000	2,281,000
	1972	15,000,000	2,634,500
	1973	15,000,000	7,500,000[1]
	1974	16,500,000	2,593,500
	1975	17,300,000	2,594,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides funds through formula grants to States to establish and maintain local, regional, State or interstate cooperative networks of libraries for the coordination of informational services of school, public, academic, and special libraries and information centers, permitting the user of any one type of library to draw on all libraries and information centers. No State matching is required.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In 1974, an estimated 130 cooperative projects were supported, ten more than in FY 1973. Nearly 10,500 libraries were involved in these projects. Participation by all classes of libraries in telecommunications or information processing systems has increased. Also, planning within States as well as multi-State planning for coordination of library services is increasing.

---

[1] $4,770,000 of the 1973 appropriation was impounded and not released until FY 1974. Program data for FY 1973 in this report reflects the FY 1973 expenditure of $2,730,000.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation study of Interlibrary Cooperation and Library Demonstrations was included in the FY 75 OE Evaluation Plan.

Source of Evaluation Data:

Program Operational Data

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

College Library Resources

Legislation: | **Expiration Date:**

Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-A | 1975

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	$ 50,000,000	$ 10,000,000
	1967	50,000,000	25,000,000
	1968	50,000,000	25,000,000
	1969	25,000,000	25,000,000
	1970	75,000,000	12,500,000
	1971	90,000,000	9,900,000
	1972	90,000,000	11,000,000
	1973	75,000,000	12,500,000
	1974	56,670,000	9,985,000
	1975	70,000,000	9,975,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program authorizes grants to institutions of higher education and to branches of such institutions in communities other than that of the parent institution to assist and encourage them in the acquisition of library resources -- books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials. In addition, the Education Amendments of 1972 broadened eligibility to include other public and private nonprofit library institutions whose primary function is to provide library and information services to institutions of higher education on a formal, cooperative basis. Three types of grants are awarded to eligible institutions of higher education: (1) Basic grants of up to $5,000, provided that the applicant expends at least the same amount from institutional funds for library resources; (2) Supplemental grants of up to $20 per full-time student (or full-time equivalent of part-time students) and (3) Special Purpose grants, unrestricted as to the amount requested but which must be matched with $1 of institutional funds for library resources for every $3 of Federal funds. For both the Basic and Special Purpose grant categories, applicants must meet maintenance-of-effort requirements in two areas -- total library purposes and library resources.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

The Education Amendments of 1972 mandated that funds available under the Title II-A program must first be used to satisfy all Basic grants, and then any remainder is to be used for supplemental grants; up to 25 percent may be reserved by the Commissioner of Education for Special Purpose grants.

Regulations, including point scoring for Supplemental and Special Purpose grant applications were published in the Federal Register on November 18, 1974.

In Fiscal Year 1974, 2377 Basic grants were awarded, the maximum grant to any institution being $4,235. Since the inception of the program in 1966, approximately 2,200 institutes of higher education have participated annually, and 23,660 awards for Basic, supplemental, and special purpose grants totalling $135.5 million have been made. These awards resulted in the acquisition of over 10 million library volumes. Under the Special Purpose Grant program, 470 grants were awarded through 1973 to support the needs of special institutional or research centers in academic libraries and to encourage interlibrary cooperation through the support of programs of shared resources.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no ongoing or planned evaluation studies directly related to this program.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program Operational Data

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Training in Librarianship

Legislation:

Higher Education Act of 1965,
Title II-B

Expiration Date:

FY 1975

FUNDING HISTORY:

YEAR	AUTHORIZATION*	APPROPRIATION
1966	$15,000,000	$1,000,000
1967	15,000,000	3,750,000
1968	15,000,000	8,250,000
1969	11,000,000	8,250,000
1970	28,000,000	6,833,000
1971	38,000,000	3,900,000
1972	38,000,000	1,939,000
1973	15,000,000	3,558,000
1974	18,890,000	2,850,000
1975	30,000,000	2,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides grants to institutions of higher education and other non-profit library organizations or agencies, to support training and retraining of librarians and information scientists, including paraprofessionals, for service in all types of libraries and information centers. Professional training is accomplished through short and long-term institutes, traineeships, and pre- and post-baccalaureate fellowships.

The authorizing legislation requires that of the amount appropriated for demonstration and training 66 2/3 percent must be used for library training. Of the amount for library training 50% must be used for the support of fellowships and traineeships.

Program Scope:

Since its inception, the program has awarded 3047 fellowships and traineeships and provided institute training funds for 11,413 participants. The program is directed toward:

---

*Combined authorization with Library Research and Demonstration

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(1) The attraction of minority and/or economically deprived persons into the library, media, and information science fields as professionals and paraprofessionals;

(2) The training and retraining of professionals in service to the disadvantaged, including the aged and the handicapped;

(3) The presentation of alternatives for recruitment, training and utilization of library personnel and manpower;

(4) The fostering and development of innovative practice to reform and revitalize the traditional system of library and information service;

(5) The retraining of professional librarians in the mastery of new skills and competencies in support of key priority need areas, such as: Learning to read campaigns, drug abuse education, environmental and ecological education, early childhood education, career education, management (planning, evaluation, and needs assessment), human relations and social interaction, service to the institutionalized, community learning center programs, service to foster the quality of life, intellectual freedom, and institute planning;

(6) The training of trainers;

(7) The training of library trustees, school administrators, and other persons with administrative, supervisory, and/or advisory responsibility for library, media, and information services, such as boards of education, State advisory councils, etc.;

(8) The training and retraining of persons in law librarianship.

Program Effectiveness:

Two formal evaluation studies of this program have been made. The first in FY 1969 by the Bureau of Social Science was restricted to the fellowship program. It found at that time that all 3 types of graduate support (the masters, post masters and Ph.D. programs) were accomplishing their intended goals; however, the study indicated that the master's program was most effective out of the three studied for bringing in new personnel to library areas outside of the academic library field. The second study was performed by Rutgers University and examined the institute program. Interviews were conducted with institute directors, Regional Program Officers, and the staff from the library bureau. It was found that the area of greatest institute impact is in the area of school media personnel (a specialist who integrates print and non-print resources with the formal learning experience).

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no evaluation studies planned for this area in the near future.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Overview of the Library Fellowship Program; by the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. of Washington, D.C., 1970.

Data Collection and Description of HEA Title II-B Institutes, by Rutgers, 1972.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Library Demonstrations

Legislation:

Higher Education Act of 1965
Title II-B

Expiration Date:

FY 1975

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1967	(See Library Training Authorization)	$3,500,000
	1968		3,500,000
	1969		2,000,000
	1970		2,100,000
	1971		2,171,000
	1972		2,000,000
	1973		1,785,000
	1974		1,425,000
	1975		1,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

This program provides funds through grants and contracts to improve libraries and information science by demonstration, and dissemination. The impetus provided by the redirection of 1971 continues to focus support on improving services to the disadvantaged. This program now funds projects conducting field demonstrations of new delivery systems that would facilitate access to and sustain the knowledge and information needs of the general population with particular focus on the critically deprived persons. A major effort is to improve the efficiency of the total library system, particularly through resource sharing and attracting new resources for mutual benefit.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In FY 1974 twenty projects were funded, representing both continuations and new starts. A representation of the focus and the type of projects funded, their purpose, and their intended audience is described in the following:

A. New Delivery Systems with Emphasis on the Disadvantaged

The Chicago Public Library is developing a model of information services to Spanish speaking residents -- this demonstration is presently in operation at El Centro de la Causa branch library.

In an effort to provide in-service training for geographically isolated communities, the University of Denver has installed a Communication Technology Satellite.

East Central State College (Ada, Oklahoma) has developed a delivery system for library and learning services in a ten county rural area.

A model of community information services to the urban disadvantaged has been developed through a cooperative program involving five major public libraries - Houston, Detroit, Cleveland, Atlanta and Queens Borough.

In Appalachia the Morehead State University is working with public libraries and the Adult Basic Education services to provide an information program for the educationally deprived.

The National Indian Education Association is developing a model of information services to serve the American Indian, with special attention to the residents of reservations.

A project designed to enhance the role of public libraries as community learning centers and improve the educational services of the public library to adult learners who are engaged or wish to become engaged in independent learning activities is being performed by the College Entrance Examination Board.

B. Improve Efficiency and Attract New Resources

Projects designed to emphasize the utilization of common resources, improve the efficiency of present operational concepts and attempts to attract new resources have succeeded in attracting about four dollars in funding for each Federal dollar supplied -- (from foundations, State governments and others). More than half of the projects involve libraries of diverse types (school, public, or academic) and non-library agencies to pool their resources and services.

The Associated Colleges of the Midwest Periodical Bank provides services to 70 member public and academic libraries. This service is provided with a fraction of the collection which would otherwise be required.

Due to the increased interest in community information services, the work of the American Institute of Architects Research Corporation, is intended to provide basic criteria for the utilization of spatial environment. Emphasis will be made on the redesign and use of existing facilities. Uniform professional criteria will avoid the duplication of library design activities.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation study of Library Demonstrations and Inter-library Cooperations was included in the FY 1975 Evaluation Plan.

Sources of Evaluation Studies:

Individual Project evaluative data.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

School Library Resources

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (P.L. 89-10, P.L. 89-750, P.L. 90-247, P.L. 91-230, P.L. 92-318, P.L. 93-380)	June 30, 1978

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1966	$ 100,000,000	$100,000,000
	1967	125,000,000	102,000,000
	1968	150,000,000	99,234,000
	1969	162,500,000	50,000,000
	1970	200,000,000	42,500,000
	1971	200,000,000	80,000,000
	1972	210,000,000	90,000,000
	1973	220,000,000	100,000,000
	1974	220,000,000	90,000,000
	1975	220,000,000	95,250,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of ESEA Title II is to provide school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools. Approved plans are in effect for 50 States, the District of Columbia, five outlying areas, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Plans include assurance of: administration of the program under relative need and selection criteria; equitable treatment of the private sector; and maintenance of effort. Plans remain in effect from year to year but are amended to reflect material changes in program. During FY 1973, amendments were reviewed and approved in accordance with a section of the Education Amendments of 1972 that required that in administering Title II, equal consideration be given to the needs of elementary and secondary schools for instructional materials to be used in instruction, orientation, and guidance and counseling in occupational education.

The Title II program consists of two components -- acquisition of materials and administration. The acquisition program includes the purchase, lease-purchase, or straight lease of instructional materials and the necessary costs of ordering, processing, cataloging materials and delivery of them to the initial place at which they are made available for use. Administration includes those executive, supervisory, and management responsibilities vested in State education agencies necessary to carry out State plans. Five percent of the amount paid to the State, or $50,000, whichever is greater, is available for administration of the State plan.

Program Scope:

Information about Title II comes from the annual reports from State departments of education used each fiscal year as the basis for program reports and from other publications on the program. The reports show that very nearly all eligible public and private school children have benefitted. Title II is the foremost OE program providing aid to private school children. (See Table on following page).

Funds expended for materials under Title II are shown below. The proportion expended for audiovisual media has risen from 19 to 50 percent over a nine-year period, indicating significant interest and effort to use audiovisual media in elementary and secondary school teaching and learning. All media made available under the program has provided the increased quantities needed for innovative new teaching strategies, e.g., modular and flexible scheduling, individualized programs, interdisciplinary courses, inquiry learning, and simulation, and games teaching.

Fiscal Year	Trade Books		Other Printed Media		Textbooks		AV		Total	
	Amount (in millions)	%	Amount (in millions)	%	Amount (in millions)	%	Amount (in millions)	%	Amount (in millions)	%
1966	$64.0	74.8	$2.2	2.6	$2.9	3.4	$16.4	19.2	$85.5	
1967	62.0	69.7	2.4	2.7	3.1	3.5	21.4	24.1	88.9	
1968	59.1	67.5	2.0	2.3	2.1	2.4	24.5	27.9	87.7	
1969	29.1	65.3	1.6	3.6	1.6	3.6	12.3	27.6	44.6	
1970	22.2	65.7	1.5	4.4	0.2	0.6	9.9	29.3	33.8	
1971	38.3	59.4	1.6	2.5	1.0	1.6	23.6	36.6	64.5	
1972	41.2	55.0	2.3	3.1	0.7	0.9	30.7	41.0	74.9	
*1973	35.4	46.0	2.5	3.3	0.8	1.0	38.9	50.1	77.6	
*1974	38.7	46.0	2.5	3.0	.9	1.1	42.1	50.0	84.2	
Total	$390.0	60.7	$18.6	2.9	$13.3	2.1	$219.8	34.3	$641.7	

*Estimated

School Library Resources

ESEA Title II

Fiscal Year	Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Eligible	Participating	Percent	Non-Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Eligible	Participating	Percent	Total Eligible	Participating	Percent
1966	40,347,018	37,418,007	93	5,973,625	5,708,766	92.2	46,320,643	43,126,773	93
1967	42,250,705	39,124,304	93	5,617,043	5,513,707	98.0	47,867,748	44,638,011	93
1968	43,698,769	39,981,644	91	5,568,413	5,338,908	95.0	49,267,182	45,320,552	92
1969	45,619,000	39,232,340	86	5,500,000	5,115,000	93	51,119,000	44,347,340	86.8
1970	45,909,000	41,731,281	90.9	5,400,000	4,946,400	91.6	51,309,000	46,677,681	90.9
1971	46,081,000	42,578,844	92.4	5,200,000	4,560,400	87.7	51,281,000	47,139,244	91.9
1972	45,754,000	41,864,910	91.5	5,000,000	4,420,000	88.4	50,754,000	46,284,910	91.2
1973	45,400,000	42,222,000	93	4,900,000	4,704,000	96	50,300,000	46,926,000	93.3
1974	45,000,000	41,850,000	93	4,800,000	4,608,000	96	49,800,000	46,458,000	93.3

Revised Estimates, based in part on Projections of Educational Statistics to 1982-83. 1973 Edition. p. 23.

Program Effectiveness:

Major findings on program impact from program reports are:

1. The program has aided the education of economically, culturally, and otherwise disadvantaged children, and to all children who attend schools with insufficient quantities of instructional materials.
2. Title II has been useful in strengthening educational quality and opportunity by providing media necessary for the introduction of new subjects to the curriculum, e.g. environmental/ecological studies, career educationa, early childhood, and American studies.
3. Many children now have the use of certain types of educational media for the first time, e.g. 8mm films, tape cassettes, transparencies, art prints, and paper back books, which assist teachers to adjust learning to individual needs.
4. The proportion of public elementary schools with media centers has increased significantly.
5. Title II not only supplemented State, local, and private support for instructional materials but actually stimulated increased support. The program also stimulated employment for large numbers of professional, para-professional, and clerical media personnel.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None.

Sources of Evaluative Data:

1. First Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1966, ESEA Title II (OE-20108)
2. Second Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1967, ESEA Title II (OE-10108-67)
3. Third Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1968, ESEA Title II (OE-20108-68)
4. The Federal-State Partnership for Education, pp. 67-97 (OE-23050-70)
5. State Departments of Education and Federal Programs, pp. 98-125(OE-72-68)
6. Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1971, ESEA Title II
7. Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1972, ESEA Title II (OE 73-21103)

8. Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1973, ESEA Title II (available in FY 1975)

9. Descriptive Case Studies of Nine Elementary School Media Centers in Three Inner Cities (OE-30021)

10. Emphasis on Excellence in School Media Programs (OE-20123)

11. How ESEA Title II Meets The Needs of Poor Children; A Special Report.

12. An Evaluative Survey Report on ESEA Title II Fiscal Years 1966-68. Part I - Analysis and Interpretation; Part II-Tables.

13. Notable Reading Projects, 11 issues, March 1971 - Jan. - March, 1973.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Undergraduate Instructional Equipment

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VI-A	FY 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1966	$35,000,000	$15,000,000
1967	50,000,000	14,500,000
1968	60,000,000	14,500,000
1969	60,000,000	14,500,000
1970	60,000,000	-0-
1971	60,000,000	7,000,000
1972	60,000,000	12,500,000
1973	60,000,000	12,500,000
1974	60,000,000	11,875,000
1975	60,000,000	7,500,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to improve the quality of undergraduate instruction in institutions of higher education by providing financial assistance on a matching basis for the acquisition of instructional equipment, materials and related minor remodeling. Funds are allocated to the States by a formula based on higher education enrollment and per capita income. State Commissions rank applications submitted by the institutions and recommend the Federal share which, except in hardship cases, may not exceed 50 percent of the total project cost.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

Eligiblity under the program includes public and non-profit universities, colleges, community and junior colleges, hospital schools of nursing, and post-secondary vocational and technical schools.

All types of instructional equipment, including closed circuit television (CCTV) equipment and materials that relate directly to a specific instructional project, can be included with the exception of general library acquisitions, large scale computers, general purpose furniture, glassware, chemicals, supplies, radio and television broadcast apparatus (other than CCTV), textbooks, and recreational equipment.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

There are no ongoing or planned evaluation studies directly related to this program.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program operating data

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Elementary and Secondary Equipment and Minor Remodeling.

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
NDEA Title III (P.L. 85-864), as amended by P.L. 93-380	June 30, 1977

FUNDING HISTORY:	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1965	$ 100,000,000	$ 76,600,000
	1966	110,000,000	88,200,000
	1967	110,000,000	88,200,000
	1968	120,000,000	82,700,000
	1969	120,000,000	78,740,000
	1970	130,500,000	37,740,000
	1971	140,500,000	50,000,000
	1972	140,500,000	50,000,000
	1973	140,500,000	50,000,000
	1974	140,500,000	28,500,000
	1975	140,500,000	21,750,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

Fiscal 1974 was the 16th year in which the program funded under Title III-A of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) supported the improvement of instruction through the purchase of equipment and materials and minor remodeling and through administrative services provided by State Departments of Education. The number of eligible academic subject areas increased from 3 to 12: the arts, civics, economics, English, geography, history, the humanities, industrial arts, mathematics, modern foreign languages, reading, and science.

NDEA is a matching program. The Federal share is up to one-half of the expenditures for acquisition of equipment, materials, and minor remodeling, and for administration of the State plan. Local education agencies pay a share of the costs of projects approved by the State Departments of Education and are reimbursed for the remaining amount by Federal funds.

Section 303(a)(2) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and the Title III-A regulations, require the State plan to develop principles for determining the priority of projects to be approved. The principles should reflect consideration of the State's educational goals and State standards, the total general educational need in the academic subjects named in Title III-A, the special instructional needs which the program may serve, the special requirements for equipment and facilities in each of the subject areas and grade levels, and the categories of eligible equipment, and materials, and types of allowable minor remodeling.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In prior years, a majority of States formulated general objectives which usually included strengthening instruction in the academic subjects by assisting local education agencies to acquire equipment and materials, improving supervisory and related services, conducting needs assessment, and improving evaluation procedures. Some States cited specific priroties among the academic subjects, giving emphasis, for example, to reading and ecological problems in relation to science and social studies. Some stressed services for the disadvantaged and handicapped, the slow learner, and the gifted. Many emphasized improved and innovative teaching strategies and enrichment of curriculums through the use of multi-media.

Management activities undertaken to achieve the objectives formulated in each State for administration of the NDEA Title III-A program included the cooperation of supervisors and subject area specialists in needs assessment, planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and dissemination of projects. All States prepare guidelines and forms for project applications, procedures and criteria for reviewing and approving projects, curriculum guides, and standards for media and equipment. They also provide inservice training in the use of equipment and materials.

A portion of the Federal allotment is used for administration of the NDEA Title III-A program. Federal expenditures are more than matched by State Department of Education expenditures. Administrative funds are used for such items as salaries of professional and clerical staff assigned to the program, for workshops and conferences dealing with instruction in the academic subjects, staff travel, office equipment, and other equipment used for State programs of supervision in the academic subjects.

Federal, State, and local total expenditures in the last year for which data is available under the NDEA Title III program for equipment, materials, and minor remodeling used to strengthen instruction in the academic subjects amounted to $86.9 million. Of this amount, $85.3 million went for equipment and materials, with less than 2 percent used for minor remodeling. Equipment purchased included audiovisual equipment such as projectors, recording equipment, television receivers and recorders, laboratory and other equipment such as microscopes, planetariums, biological slides and models, tachistoscopes, individual reading pacers, and laboratory apparatus for physical construction of mathematical models. Materials purchased included such items as 8 and 16mm films, filmstrips, tape and disc recordings, books, maps, globes, charts, instructional games, and pamphlets and periodicals.

Although the bulk of NDEA Title III funds has been spent for years to purchase equipment and materials for strengthening instruction in the natural sciences, expenditures for English and reading instruction ranked first in the last reported year, amounting to $26.4 million. Expenditures for natural sciences and social sciences ranked second and third with expenditures amounting to $21.4 million and $12.9 million, respectively. Among the seven subject areas, expenditures for equipment and materials for use in mathematics and modern foreign language instruction ranked lowest.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

State departments of education conduct State-wide and individual project assessments whenever these are considered appropriate. Many States require that procedures for evaluation of projects be included in project applications.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. USOE, NDEA Title III, Fiscal Year 1959-67, A Management View, May 1969.
2. "Strengthening Instruction in Science, Mathematics, Foreign Languages, and the Humanities and Arts," A chapter appearing in the The Federal-State Partnership for Education, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, May 1970.
3. USOE, Program Statistics compiled by the U.S. Office of Education.
4. USOE, Strengthening Instruction in Academic Subjects, Title III, Part A, National Defense Education Act as Amended, Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1972, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1973.

G. EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Broadcasting Facilities

Legislation: Expiration Date:

Communications Act of 1934, as amended
Title III, Part IV

FY 1975

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	$32,000,000	$13,000,000
1966	for 5-year	8,826,000
1967	period 63-67	3,304,000*
1968	10,500,000	-0-
1969	12,500,000	4,000,000
1970	15,000,000	4,321,000
1971	15,000,000	11,000,000
1972	15,000,000	13,000,000
1973	25,000,000	13,000,000
1974	25,000,000	15,675,000
1975	30,000,000	12,000,000

*remaining amount available of $32 million authorization.

Program Purpose and Operation:

Matching funds are provided for the acquisition of transmission apparatus necessary for initial establishment or expansion of noncommercial broadcasting facilities to serve educational, cultural, and informational needs in homes and schools. Up to 75 percent matching grants are made to eligible tax supported institutions (such as school districts, colleges and universities), State Educational Broadcasting Agencies, nonprofit foundations, organized primarily to operate noncommercial broadcasting facilities, and municipalities which own or operate a facility used only for noncommercial educational broadcasting. No State may receive more than 8-1/2 percent of the appropriation in any one year.

The major goal of this program is to stimulate the development of broadcast facilities necessary for a nation-wide system of noncommercial educational public broadcasting stations technically and programmatically capable of serving local, State, and national needs; and to make available a state-of-the-art noncommercial broadcast service capable of producing quality local programs.

Program Scope:

In Fiscal Year 1974, 74 noncommercial Educational Radio (ER) and Educational Television (ETV) stations received grant support under this program. Forty seven grants were for ETV: 6 grants for new activations and 41 grants for expansion or improvement of an existing facility. The remaining 27 grants were made to ER stations and represented 4 new starts and 23 grants for upgrading activities. The total number of noncommercial television stations on the air or under construction increased from 76 in 1963 to 241 by the end of FY 1974. During this same period 217 of the existing noncommercial television stations improved or expanded their facilities with Federal assistance.

The number of full-service public radio stations in the country has increased from 40 in 1969, when Federal assistance to non-commercial radio stations was first made available, to 153 on-the-air or under construction at the end of FY 1974. Eighty seven of these radio stations utilized Federal assistance to expand and/or improve their facilities to become full-service community stations. Approximately 80% of the households in the U.S. are within reach of a noncommercial television signal; about 65% are served by noncommercial radio. At the present time 35 of the major metropolitan areas and much of the rural population of the country are without full-service public radio service.

Program Effectiveness:

In the 11 years of Federal participation, the failure rate of stations which have become operational with help from the Federal Government has been zero. Only two of the stations expanded with EBFP assistance have ceased operation.

Many local noncommercial broadcast stations are able to receive the network program services provided by the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS). The PBS program offerings to these stations have been highly beneficial by enabling them to devote a greater amount of their resources to local quality productions. According to a recent survey, approximately 53% of the nation's schools receive instructional programs and 57% of elementary and secondary students use educational telecasts.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies

The Program (EBFP) utilizes studies conducted by the National Center for Educational Statistics in the continuing process of awarding Federal assistance grants and in the planning and development of needed broadcast facilities. Basic data is collected in five areas: (a) financial and programming, (b) employee, (c) station and transmission facilities (d) broadcast data, and (e) management personnel. The program continues to identify new data needs by keeping in close communication with all organizations which carry out research in the field of telecommunications.

A study for the Office of Education performed by Battelle's Columbus Laboratories entitled A PLANNING STUDY - THE FUTURE OF EDUCATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS, was completed this year.

The study concluded that public telecommunications has great potential, but to fulfill that potential there is a need for re-examining goals, broadening current guidelines to take advantage of new technology, improving distribution capabilities, and setting minimum standards for production facilities. For the EBFP program it was recommended -- that primary emphasis be focused on extended and improved transmission, and the funding of production capabilities must be carefully balanced between the need for substantial pools of talent and equipment and the desire for local activity.

Sources of Evaluation Studies:

1) EBFP Historical Operating Data

2) Surveys of existing facilities made by the National Center for Educational Statistics

3) Corporation for Public Broadcasting surveys and studies

4) National Association for Educational Broadcasting research studies.

5) A Planning Study -- The Future of Educational Telecommunications February, 1974, Battelle's Columbus Laboratories.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Educational Television Programming Support

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Cooperative Research Act (P.L. 83-531) as amended	FY 1975
Special Projects Act (P.L. 93-380)	FY 1976

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1972	Indefinite	$2,600,000
1973	Indefinite	7,000,000
1974	Indefinite	6,000,000
1975	Indefinite	7,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The Children's Television Workshop, producers of SESAME STREET and the ELECTRIC COMPANY, is an independent nonprofit organization chartered by the Regents, State University of New York. Support for SESAME STREET and THE ELECTRIC COMPANY comes from Federal, private and CTW self generated income with the U.S. Office of Education and the Program Cooperative, Public Broadcasting Service, as the main Federal contributors. CTW created and produced SESAME STREET, which is now in its sixth season of operation and THE ELECTRIC COMPANY, which is in its fourth year.

SESAME STREET is an educational television program targeted at preschool disadvantaged children. Its major objective is to present the nation's three, four, and five year olds with an educational experience which will prepare them for school by stimulating their appetite for learning. The sixth season of SESAME STREET will be built around a curriculum of preschool instruction including symbolic representation, cognitive process, reasoning and problem-solving, and the child and his environment. Recently, the curriculum has been expanded to include bilingual-bicultural and ecological topics. An added dimension will be programming directed at divergent or creative thinking involving the ability to view individual objects in terms of the great many functions, or uses they can have. One goal in the social sphere is to introduce topics on career education and sex roles. Puppets, live-action film, and segments created on set have been designed to widen the occupational picture and make various careers and functions familiar and accessible to viewers. Little is known at present about the manner in which information on careers and sex roles works to affect children's developing conceptions about their own careers, or even more importantly, what effects on the career aspirations of young children may be achieved through planned intervention via television. A major objective, therefore, in planning an approach for SESAME STREET will be to determine what types of objectives it is appropriate to strive for; how much to emphasize positive options vs. criticism of prevailing stereotypes; what types of information and what forms of production implementation seem most likely to lead to the various specific objectives which will have been defined.

The curriculum runs for 26 weeks (130 hour-long programs), is produced in color, and most recently, has been offered for distribution beginning November 4, 1974. Television stations will broadcast the full series over a 26-week period, and then rebroadcast the programs in sequence over a second 26-week period, up to mid-November 1975.

THE ELECTRIC COMPANY is designed to provide supplementary reading instruction for seven to ten-year-old children who are experiencing difficulties in learning to read. The target audience for the program is the second grader in the bottom half of his reading class. Since the original anticipation was that children would view the series at home without teacher supervision, modest goals were set in the area of decoding print. Over the course of subsequent seasons, as research with child viewers and consultation with advisors led to better production, the curriculum has shifted somewhat to reflect television's unique capability to graphically represent processes involved in reading, in addition to the phonic information. The evolution toward a process approach is evident in the changes in curriculum statements for successive seasons. For example, there has been a decided shift in the presentation of one of the key skills on reading, from focusing on particular sounds to be blended, towards the process of combining sounds.

THE ELECTRIC COMPANY will consist of 130 half-hour programs, produced in color, and offered for distribution beginning October 21, 1974 for a 26-week period, and then re-broadcast in sequence for a second 26-week period, up to October of 1975.

Program Scope:

Last year approximately 10 million children viewed SESAME STREET and 5 million viewed THE ELECTRIC COMPANY either at home or in the classroom. In a real sense, neither television nor the field of early childhood education in their broadest definition, will ever be quite the same again, since it was demonstrated that, for less than a penny a program, a child could learn useful academic and social skills from mass media.

Program Effectiveness:

Robert K. Yin, writing in "The Workshop and the World," a 1973 Rand Corporation Study states that, "The activities of the Children's Television Workshop have produced an impact on many different audiences. CTW has not only affected children's learning, but also may have changed parent and teacher attitudes toward early learning, influenced the use of television in schools, and changed attitudes toward producing new public broadcasting programs."

The models and standards set have reached well beyond CTW to commercial and educational television around the world. Over fifty countries now broadcast SESAME STREET in the original version. Three foreign language versions, in German, Portuguese, and Spanish, have been produced with CTW consultation, and others are in development. Much new children's programming now makes use of CTW models for educator input and evaluation. This is especially true in programs developed by government and philanthropic sources. Much of the initial planning of these projects--involving specification of educational and/or social goals, research-production interaction, a working advisory group of educational experts, budget projections adequate for mass audience entertainment (where that is a goal) and professional evaluation--is built upon CTW experience and many funders now require that these or similar concerns be addressed.

There are two concurrent thrusts to CTW evaluation: formative and summative. Formative evaluation refers to the collection of evidence during the development of a new curriculum in such a way that revisions of the curriculum can be based on this evidence. Formative evaluation provides CTW programs with the self-correction mechanism that contributes most to increasing effectiveness. A summative evaluation is used at the end of an educational course or program to determine its effectiveness. The formative techniques include: the ability of producers and educators to closely cooperate in developing quality programming; the development of the Writers Notebook, (an operating manual based on the programs instructional goals which approaches each goal in terms of suggestions for production of broadcast material); curriculum quality control maintained by periodic re-evaluations of older material; pre-testing segments with groups of children in different settings, to determine both appeal and educational effectiveness, role playing, interviews with children, and other formative techniques that have been refined as the programs are tested on children in lower socioeconomic neighborhoods. Summative evaluation is conducted to determine if goals were achieved. It is done by contract with independent testing organizations, such as the Educational Testing Service and Research Triangle Institute. Rather than prove the same things annually the summative evaluation focuses on expanded or revised curriculum goals.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

The Office of Education has contracted with the Institute for Communications Research, Indiana University, to conduct a study on "The Federal Role in Children's Television Programming." Data from this study will assist in future formulations of policy and funding decisions, through an analysis and estimate of the potential audiences and impact, examination of program alternatives, definitions of alternative Federal roles in support of children's television programs, examination of alternative communications formats and identification of areas for future research and study.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. The First Year of Sesame Street: An Evaluation, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, October 1970.

2. The Second Year of Sesame Street: A Continuing Evaluation, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, October 1971.

3. Who Watched the Electric Company, The Electric Company in School Utilization Study: The 1971-72 School and Teacher Survey, Center for the Study of Education, Institute for Social Education, Florida State University, 1972.

4. The Children's Television Workshop: How and Why It Works, Nassau County Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Jericho, New York, 1972.

5. A Summary of the Major Findings from "Reading With Television: An Evaluation of The Electric Company", Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, March 1973.

6. The Workshop and the World: Toward An Assessment of the Children's Television Workshop, Rand Corporation, October 1973.

7. The Federal Role In Children's Television, Indiana University (Expected Competion Date April 1975)

H. SPECIAL DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Right-to-Read

Legislation:

Cooperative Research Act (P.L. 85-531)
as amended

Expiration Date:

FY 1975

Funding History:

	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
FY	1971	Indefinite	$ 2,000,000
	1972	Indefinite	12,000,000
	1973	Indefinite	12,000,000
	1974	Indefinite	12,000,000
	1975	Indefinite	12,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The long-range goal of the Right to Read Program is to substantially increase functional literacy in this country. More specifically, the operational goal of **Right to Read** is to ensure that by 1980 ninety-nine percent of all people under 16 years of age living in the United States and ninety percent of all those over 16 will possess and use literacy skills. The ability to read is essential for one to function effectively as an adult in our society. Yet more than three million adults in the United States are illiterate and approximately 18-1/2 million cannot read well enough to complete simple tasks required for common living needs. Millions of public school children require special instruction in reading. Even after they have completed high school, one-third of the new students in junior colleges need some type of reading help.

Through the demonstration of effective and efficient reading programs and the provision of technical assistance and training, the objective of Right to Read is to help all reading programs to become effective, regardless of the source of funding, the level of instruction or the age of the participant. This program hopes to influence Federal formula grant and discretionary funds as well as State and local funds, and will involve experimental, demonstration, service and capacity-building activities. It will also be responsible for awarding a limited number of grants and contracts.

Program Scope:

The Right to Read Program provided support in various ways for State and local participants during FY 74. By the end of the year, 174 projects had been funded of which 68 were community based and 106 were school based. Thirty-three of the projects were bilingual.

The 68 community based programs were directed toward the out-of-school adolescent population, the young adult and the older adult in need of reading help. Community based programs were much more diverse in type of location, population and program intent, and could be found, for example, in prisons, community colleges, local communities and on reservations.

Thirty-one State Education Agencies have now been funded to develop and implement State-wide plans for the elimination of illiteracy. Key foci are; training local reading directors, providing technical assistance to LEA's, disseminating program information, amassing public support for literacy efforts, conducting exemplary reading projects focused on training, and providing technical assistance designed to stimulate more effective reading programs throughout the State. In addition, five colleges received funds, which provided technical assistance through educational planners and reading consultants, who assisted projects in assessing needs, planning and implementing the reading programs as well as assisting in internal evaluation.

Program Effectiveness:

An evaluative study conducted by Contemporary Research, Inc. of 44 of the 106 school based sites in FY 73 revealed that 28 of the 44 schools met or exceeded the criterion of one month gain in reading achievement for each month of reading instruction. Sixteen of the 44 schools failed to achieve the objective. Factors contributing to lack of achievement of the goal were: (1) request for extension of deadline for post-testing; (2) pre- and post-test data not on the same group of students; (3) many different reading tests used; (4) test data not in conformance with Right to Read requirements; and (5) late submission of test data. The study is of questionable validity because the sample was clearly not representative and the data aggregated were of the "apples and oranges" variety. In addition, the study makes no provision for determining the statistical significance of reported reading gains.

The validation group of the Division of Management Improvement, Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Management, Planning and Technology submitted a Validation Study Report on the Right to Read State Program in September 1974, as is customary for the few programs the Secretary selects for priority tracking. The validation group visited four of the 31 funded States and made several recommendations emanating from its primary conclusion that the Right to Read State FY 74 Program objectives were not achieved.

Lessons learned from the 1974 experience suggest:

(1) The need for ongoing technical assistance in the STate capacity-building tasks and the resultant need for staff with expertise in State agency operations, training, resource analysis and coordination;

(2) The formulation of a viable liaison between demonstration projects and SEA's in order to facilitate their utilization;

(3) The involvement of Right to Read State Directors in the development of various instruments and materials; and

(4) The need to increase the number of local directors in the training program; and the level of funding for Right to Read.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An evaluation contract was let November 1973 to Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corporation, Berkeley to study the effectiveness of the Community Based Right to Read Program. The final report of this study is due in November 1974. The findings will be based on a random sample of 24 projects drawn from the FY 74 population of 73 funded projects. The sampled projects involve two distinct models, e.g., 13 projects that serve "in school" youth and 11 projects that serve "out-of-school" adults. The purpose of the study is to discern the reading gains of students and adults in the sampled projects. The results of this study should allow program administrators to make judgments concerning some types of community based projects that are effective for various kinds of participants in various settings.

Source of Evaluation Data:

1. The Information Base for Reading, 1971.
2. Evaluation of School Based Right to Read Sites. Contemporary Research, Incorporated, Los Angeles, California. October 1973.
3. Evaluation of a Sample of Community Based Right to Read Projects. Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corporation, Berkeley, California. 1973.
4. Briefing Package for the ASE Management Conference. October 23, 1974.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Drug Abuse Education

Legislation:	**Expiration Date:**
Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-527); The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act (P.L. 93-422)	FY 1977

Funding History:	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
	1971	$10,000,000	$ 5,610,000
	1972	20,000,000	12,400,000
	1973	28,000,000	12,400,000
	1974	28,000,000	6,000,000
	1975	26,000,000	--

Program Purpose and Operation:

The principal purpose of the Program is to help schools and communities assess and respond to their drug problems by becoming aware of the nature of the problem and capable of developing strategies aimed at its causes rather than merely its symptoms. The program strongly encourages a coordinated school-community effort.

Grants are awarded to State Departments of Education to assist local educational agencies in planning, development and implementation of alcohol and drug abuse prevention programs.

Grants and contracts support activities such as the following: creative primary prevention and early intervention programs in schools; development, demonstration, evaluation and dissemination of new and improved curricula on the problems of alcohol and drug abuse for use in education programs throughout the Nation; preservice and inservice training programs for teachers, counselors, law enforcement officials and other public service and community leaders; community education programs for parents and others on alcohol and **drug** abuse problems for parents and others; and projects to recruit, train, organize and employ professionals and other persons, including former drug and alcohol abusers, to organize and participate in programs of public education in drug and alcohol abuse.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

During the 1972-73 project year there were 55 State Education Agency projects which impacted on an estimated 117,000 people through direct service, mostly in education and training, and 3.5 million people through a variety of indirect services, such as mass media efforts and the multiplier effect of training trainers. With FY 73 funds, OE program personnel continued to provide these types of services, and cooperated with the designated single State Agencies (P.L. 92-455) in the development of comprehensive State prevention plans. During this same period, one National and seven Regional Training Centers trained approximately 1200 community leadership teams of 5 to 8 members each. Finally, 18 college-based and 40 community-based projects furnished education and training to approximately 22,000 youth and adults in schools and in the community; other direct services were provided to over 37,000 young people via hotlines, crisis centers, rap centers, counseling and alternative programs. Most of these projects are continuing to provide services into Fiscal Year 1974 with Fiscal Year 1973 funds.

With Fiscal Year 1974 funds, OE initiated a new school-based team training program. Teams of educational personnel -- administrators, teachers, counselors, psychologists -- from 338 local education agencies received training and subsequent onsite support through this new program. The training of community-based teams was continued with grants to 248 communities for this purpose. Training for both school and community teams was delivered through the network of 5 regional training centers. A new demonstration program to develop models for training preservice educational personnel was started in six participating colleges and universities. The National Action Committee for Drug Education continued to provide technical assistance to the national program. Two evaluation contracts were let: one for the evaluation of the new school-based training program and the other for the evaluation of the new preservice demonstration program.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

In process are three evaluation projects:

(1) AIR evaluation of the new school-based program;

(2) ABT evaluation of the new preservice demonstration program;

(3) E.H. White evaluation of the 1973 "Help Communities Help Themselves" program involving 900 community teams. This study is supported by the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention (SAODAP).

In addition, a National Data Base located at the Chicago regional training center is amassing a variety of data on both school and community-based teams.

If funding for 1975 warrants, the Program would propose to fund a project to identify and validate promising drug abuse prevention programs nationwide.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. Training for "People" Problems: An Assessment of Federal Program Strategies for Training Teachers to Deal with Drug Education; 1971.

2. Drug Abuse Program Report: Program Evaluation by Summer Interns; 1971.

3. National Study of Drug Abuse Education Programs; 1972.

4. Field Study of Drug Use and the Youth Culture; 1972.

5. An Operationally-Based Information Support System for NDEP; in process.

6. General Research Corp., College and Communities Study; 1974

7. General Research Corp., Minigrant Study; 1974

8. BRX/Shelley, "What Works and Why" project (Fifty Successful Practices); 1974.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Environmental Education

Legislation:

Environmental Education Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-516);
Extended by P.L. 93-278

Expiration Date:

1977

Funding History:

	Year	Authorization	Appropriation
FY	1971	$ 5,000,000	$ 2,000,000
	1972	15,000,000	3,514,000[1/]
	1973	25,000,000	3,180,000
	1974	25,000,000	2,000,000
	1975	5,000,000	1,900,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

The purpose of environmental education is to help individuals perceive environments in their totalities, develop an understanding of environmental phenomena and problems, and to identify and support educational activities which can enhance environmental quality. The Environmental Education Act is intended to encourage and support the development of resources required to achieve these objectives among all age groups and sectors of the country.

The Act provides (1) broad authority for flexible, responsive support of environmental education development needs (rather than support of predesignated activities), (2) support for community group-sponsored nonformal education projects, and (3) environmental education training for persons in education and other fields, including those in business, industry and government whose activities may effect environment policies and activities and hence quality.

The overall strategy of the Office of Environmental Education is to facilitate through technical assistance and grant funds the development of environmental education, e.g., environmental studies programs and educational resources devoted to educating and informing our citizens about environmental quality and ecological balance. This strategy involves (1) development of content and process through pilot projects, (2) the dissemination and transfer of effective materials and approaches through local and national demonstration projects, and (3) through funds other than the Environmental Education Act, support of operational programs.

[1/] Approximately $2 million withheld to cover backdated FY '72 grants.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In FY '74, grant funds amounting to about $2.3 million were used to support a total of 106 environmental education projects. These included resource material development, personnel training, and community education in urban, suburban and rural areas in 37 States and the District of Columbia. By kinds of projects the breakdown is as follows:

a. Resource Materials Development -- 36

b. Personnel Development -- 7

c. Community Education -- 20

d. Elementary and Secondary Education -- 16

e. Minigrant Workshops -- 27

It is estimated that up to 5,500 people have been provided direct training through these projects. Projects funded under the Environmental Education Act during the past three years and those funded through other OE programs are being reviewed for possible dissemination. In addition, the Office of Environmental Education has awarded three contracts totalling approximately $400,000. The contracts will serve as a means of providing a conceptual framework and content resource base for the development of curriculum materials, integrating locally relevant exemplary approaches and practices to EE, identified through analysis of products and experiences from grant awards made over the past three years, as well as from those grants just awarded.

A competitive contract for $105,000 was awarded to the National Science Teachers Association for the development of instructional resource materials for teachers (Grades K-12) on energy allocation, depletion and conservation and the implications for environmental, economic and social needs. The materials will be developed in cooperation with the National Council for the Social Sciences and a special advisory committee consisting of representatives of the corporate, educational, governmental and environment communities. The materials will provide teachers with basic information on the topic of energy as well as suggestions for classroom activity and resource references.

Two contracts were awarded to Arizona State University and the Association of American Geographers for the development of basic source material on the relationships to and use of man-made environment and natural environment topics in environmental education.

Technical or non-monetary assistance activities have included (1) assisting OE, regional and headquarters, and program administrators in developing resources and expertise, (2) establishing local and regional planning and information networks, and (3) assisting other Federal agencies interested in educational programs relating to environmental quality.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluations

None at this time.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

-- ERIC/USOE Project Survey Reports/Documents

-- OE funded Project Reports

-- Developmental contract reports

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Health and Nutrition

Legislation:

Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary
Education Act of 1965, Section 808;
P.L. 93-380, Section 108

Expiration Date:

1978

Funding History:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1971	$ 10,000,000	$ 2,000,000
1972	16,000,000	2,000,000
1973	26,000,000	2,000,000
1974	--	2,000,000
1975	--	900,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of the program is to demonstrate ways through which the gap between needs and delivery of nutrition/health services for low-income children can be narrowed by coordinating, focusing, and utilizing existing health, health-related and educational resources at the local level, especially Federally funded programs. Federal programs involved in these collaborative activities are HEW Children and Youth Projects, HEW Comprehensive Health Centers, NIMH Community Mental Health Centers, as well as OEO, Model Cities and Indian Health Service programs.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In FY 71, the first eight demonstration projects were funded, reaching 10,600 children in 26 schools. In FY 72, these projects were continued and four new ones were added, bringing the number of children served up to more than 15,000 in 45 schools. In FY 73, all 12 projects were continued for another year. In FY 74, five new grant awards were made for demonstration projects for two years of operational support.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Provisions for an individual evaluation are included in each project, and plans are being made by the project staffs for the collection of appropriate data. However, these evaluations will not be available until the projects are completed.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Interim and annual progress reports are available from all twelve projects.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Dropout Prevention

Legislation:

Title VIII ESEA, Section 807
Section 107 P.L. 93-380

Expiration Date:

1978

Funding History:

Year (FY)	Authorization	Appropriation
1969	$ 30,000,000	$ 5,000,000
1970	30,000,000	5,000,000
1971	30,000,000	10,000,000
1972	31,500,000	10,000,000
1973	33,000,000	10,000,000
1974	4,000,000	4,000,000
1975	---	---

Program Purpose and Operation:

The 1967 amendments to ESEA of 1965 established Title VIII, Section 807 to develop and demonstrate educational practices which show promise in reducing the number of children who fail to complete their elementary and secondary education. Funds are granted to local educational agencies to carry out, in schools with high dropout rates and with high percentages of students from families with low-income, innovative demonstration projects aimed at reducing the dropout rate. The program was funded at $5 million beginning in FY 1969, at $10 million in FY 71 and 72; in FY 73 the operating level was $7.5 million. Nineteen projects and two one-year special projects have been funded since the program began.

For the 1969-1970 period, grants were awarded to ten school systems submitting the most imaginative proposals for reducing the number of secondary education students leaving school before graduating. For FY 1971 an additional nine grants were awarded. Each of the funded projects must demonstrate ways for reducing the dropout rates in their school systems as well as providing insights for possible replication of their projects in other school systems. For FY 1973 nineteen were continued at $7.5 million. For FY 1974, nine remaining projects were continued at $4 million.

Counseling services, staff training and curriculum or instructional revision were common activities to all projects. Fifteen projects conducted work-study or other vocational courses; four offered special services for pregnant students: and five placed major emphasis on parental involvement. One project provided a "Personal Development Center" in an off-school facility for holding informal sessions for students who were unable to relate to conventional instruction.

In each funded project independent audits of evaluation and management designs were required for the purpose of determining the nature of management and program practices of project personnel. Auditors' interim and final reports, evaluation reports from each project, and the USOE personnel participation provide the basis for gaining insights into the operation and progress of each project.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

In FY 1974, nine projects were continued at a cost of $4,000,000. In addition, ten projects previously funded and which were due to terminate in FY 1974 are still in operation because of the release of $1.5 million in funds which were impounded. The total number of student participants during the peak of the program is estimated at 60,000. Total staff is estimated at 1,100. Data provided from the projects indicate that the dropout rate has been reduced in the target schools. A current project validation effort is expected to provide definitive data concerning the overall effectiveness of the program. Dropout rates at the beginning of the program for the 19 projects ranged from a low of 5% to a high of 60%. The dropout improvement rate is currently estimated at a median gain of 46% for the 19 projects with a range of about 21% to 99%.

Information about the Dropout Prevention Program comes from two main sources: (1) the Consolidated Program Information Report which provides data primarily upon expenditures and program participation and (2) evaluation reports and individual audits on each local project. The evidence from these reports indicates that the Dropout Prevention Program is well-focused upon its target population and that most projects have been effective in reducing the dropout rate.

The Dropout Prevention Program has demonstrated that it is possible to reduce the dropout rate significantly in schools and school systems which structure themselves along an accountability model. Of the ten projects originally funded in FY 1969, data shows a 45.3% reduction in number of dropouts during a three year period for target groups. These trends are continuing. For nine additional projects funded in FY 1971, the dropout rate went from 12.4% to 8.7% in two years. Recent evaluation reports support these results. The Englewood, Colorado project reports that the dropout rate prior to institution of the project was 15%. During the first year of the project it was reduced to 5%. In the Fall River, Massachusetts project, the rate went from 15.2% to 10.7% in two years. They also report significant increases in reading achievement and self-concept, increased attendance, cooperative planning and decision-making on the part of students, teachers and administrators and parent involvement in decision-making. The Dayton, Ohio project reports that during the year prior to the initial funding of the project, the dropout rate was 18.1%. This year, the dropout rate for the target school was 7.7% but only 2.7% for the students in the dropout program. In Seattle, the project reduced dropout rates from 16.86% in the first year to 5.45% last year. Absenteeism dropped from 62.5% to 32%. At Riverton, Wyoming, the dropout rate has gone from 9.6% to 8.6%

and an almost total absence of vandalism has been noted within the target population. At Oakland, California, Project MACK started with a dropout rate of 12%. The most recently reported rate was 6.5%. Class-cutting was reduced by half and school attendance improved. The Detroit project achieved a decrease of about 38% in the dropout rate during the four years of its existence. Absenteeism decreased by 6% during the past year and expulsions declined by 6%. In Baltimore, the average dropout rate for the public schools as a whole was 13.3%. At the target area for the dropout project, the rate was 12.8% and for the project participants only 6.8%. Attendance improved and 76.1% showed improvement in most achievement areas tested. At Tuskeegee, initial dropout rates of more than 13% are now close to zero because of a unique system of use of parent-counselor aides as attendance officers and counselors.

Gains in dropout reduction are attributed to multi-component approaches which include attempt to raise achievement levels in reading and mathematics, work-study programs involving private industry and other agencies, staff training, improved pupil personnel services, community involvement, and special classes for students considered most dropout prone. Annual dropout project staff leadership conferences have served to disseminate successful practices. A handbook of practices found most useful in reducing dropout has been prepared and is in publication.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

An overall program evaluation and dissemination activity is currently in operation.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

1. FY 1973 reviews of the evaluation and audit reports from the nineteen dropout prevention program -- OE.
2. Consolidated Program Information Report -- OE. (Study under auspices of NCES)
3. Final Evaluation Report, Project Outreach, August, 1972.
4. Results of project validation activity currently in progress.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

General Program Dissemination: Office of Public Affairs

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
General Education Provisions Act, Section 412	None

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	1970	Indefinite	$1,600,000
	1971	"	500,000
	1972	"	400,000
	1973	"	400,000
	1974	"	-0-
	1975	"	250,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of General Program Dissemination is to make information available to the widest possible audience -- including the general population as well as professional educators -- about programs deriving from Office of Education supported research and practices. The funds are expended primarily through contracts for performing public information functions by means of various mass media and through meetings, conferences, or workshops. The purpose of these activities is to foster awareness of OE programs and to encourage individuals to take an active role in improving education in their communities. General Program Dissemination activities have been underway since FY 1970.

Program Scope and Effectiveness:

Funds were not appropriated for General Program Dissemination in FY 1974. Under the Continuing Resolution, however, $117,247 was obligated for prints of an Environmental Education film, which had been produced with FY 1972 funds. The obligation was charged against program administration. A number of projects funded in preceding fiscal years were ongoing during FY 1974. These include distribution of films on the Right to Read and early childhood education, and a public information campaign to stimulate student interest in seeking technician education. Available statistics indicate wide public contact of some of the products coming out of projects funded in FY 1970 through FY 1973. Between August 1971 and December 31, 1974, the film, "The Right to Read" had been shown 73,339 times to an estimated total audience of 2.7 million, and it had been telecast 2,083 times to 56.1 million viewers at a time value of $212,817. As of December 1974, "The First Years Together", a film on early childhood education had been shown 37,596 times to an estimated audience of 1.1 million. Telecasts of this film total 1,407, at a time value of $129,713, and an estimated viewership of 37 million. During FY 74, 473,400 persons who saw advertising materials on technician careers requested a copy of the booklet, "25 Technical Careers You Can Learn in Two Years or Less."

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Evaluation is built into each individual project as part of the management process. No separate formal evaluations have been performed or are contemplated.

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Informal "inhouse" assessments

I. INDIAN EDUCATION PROGRAMS

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION RPOGRAMS

Program Name:

Revision of Impacted Areas as it Relates to Indian Children
(Payments to LEA's for Indian Education)

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Indian Education Act of 1972, Public Law 92-318, Part A	July 1, 1978

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	FY 73	$196,177,204	$11,500,000
	FY 74	208,000,000	25,000,000
	FY 75	235,000,000	25,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies for elementary and secondary programs to meet the special educational needs of Indian children. Grants are made to applicant local educational agencies according to the number of Indian students enrolled and the State average per pupil expenditure. Programs funded by these grants are intended to improve educational opportunities for Indian children by providing additional teachers and teacher aides in the basic skill areas of reading and mathematics, new supportive services , including home liaison, guidance and counseling services, and bilingual/bicultural activities.

Program Scope:

Monies appropriated under Part A of the Indian Education Act are used for:

1. Grants to local education agencies which provide free education to Indian children, and

2. Financial assistance to schools on or near reservations which are non-local educational agencies in existence for more than three years.

For any fiscal year an amount not in excess of 10% of the amount appropriated for Part A will be expended for non-local educational agencies. The amount of the grant to which a local education agency is entitled is equal to the average per pupil expenditure for such agency multiplied by the sum of the number of Indian children served, as determined by the Commissioner.

If the sums appropriated for any fiscal year for making payments under this title are not sufficient to pay in full the total amounts which all local educational agencies are eligible to receive under this title for that fiscal year, the maximum amounts which all such agencies are eligible to receive under this title for such fiscal year shall be ratably reduced.

Data from the 1974 Indian enrollment/entitlement computation indicated that over 2600 local educational agencies would be eligible for funding under Part A, Title IV, P.L. 92-318. During fiscal year 1974, 1098 of these eligible agencies applied for funds to plan, develop, and/or operate programs designed to meet the special educational needs of Indian children. Of the applications received, 854 grants were awarded. (During fiscal year 1974, approximately 214,350 children were enrolled in LEA's receiving Part A grants.) These grants average approximately $111 per child.

Program Effectiveness:

This program has been in operation only a short time and measures of effectiveness will not be available until next year. However, there is currently in the developmental stage an Indian Education Program Monitoring and Process Evaluation System. This system is designed to determine if the major programs under the Indian Education Act are meeting the goals and objectives specified in the law. In this regard, an assessment of known services and activities that Indians are presently receiving and projected to receive in conjunction with some broad measures of how successful the projects are in meeting their objectives is planned.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Ongoing process evaluation survey

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program review materials

Program audits

I. Indian Education Programs

1. Revision of Impacted Areas as It Relates to Indian Children
2. Special Programs and Projects to Improve Educational Opportunities for Indian Children
3. Special Programs Relating to Adult Education for Indians

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Special Programs and Projects to Improve Educational Opportunities for Indian Children

Legislation:

Indian Education Act of 1972
P.L. 92-318, Part B

Expiration Date:

July 1, 1978

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	FY 73	$25,000,000	$ 5,000,000
	FY 74	35,000,000	12,000,000
	FY 75	35,000,000	12,000,000

Program Purpose and Operations:

The purpose of this program is to support planning, pilot, and demonstration projects to test and demonstrate the effectiveness of programs for improving educational opportunities for Indian children, by providing services not otherwise available, and by assisting in the development and operation of preservice and inservice training programs for education personnel. Grants are made, upon receipt of applications and approval by the Commissioner of Education, to Indian tribes, organizations, and institutions, State and local educational agencies, and federally supported elementary and secondary schools for Indian children. The applications fall into the general area of cultural and educational enrichment programs and services.

Program Scope:

During the fiscal year 1974, the Office of Education received 438 applications to support planning, pilot, and demonstration projects. One-hundred and thirty-five applicants received awards. The approved projects dealt with the development of bilingual/bicultural programs, instructional materials and media centers, compensatory education, cultural enrichment, dropout prevention, and vocational training.

Program Effectiveness:

This program has been in operation only a short time and measures of effectiveness will not be available until next year. However, an Indian Education Program Monitoring and Process Evaluation System is currently being developed. This system is designed to determine whether the major programs under the Indian Education Act are meeting the goals and objectives specified in the law.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

Ongoing process Evaluation Survey

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program review materials

Program audits

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT ON EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Program Name:

Special Programs Relating to Adult Education for Indians

Legislation:	Expiration Date:
Indian Education Act of 1972 P.L. 92-318, Part C	July 1, 1978

FUNDING HISTORY	YEAR	AUTHORIZATION	APPROPRIATION
	FY 73	$ 5,000,000	$ 500,000
	FY 74	8,000,000	3,000,000
	FY 75	8,000,000	3,000,000

Program Purpose and Operation:

The purpose of this program is to improve the educational opportunities for adult Indians by making grants to State not from programs per se and local educational agencies, and to Indian tribes, institutions, and organizations. The projects are designed to plan for, test and demonstrate effectiveness of programs for adult education for Indians. The projects are intended to assist in the establishment and operation of programs which are designed to provide basic literacy opportunities to all Indian adults to qualify them for high school equivalency certificates in the shortest period of time. Upon receipt of applications and approval, grants are made by the Commissioner of Education. Federally supported elementary and secondary schools are not eligible to receive grants for adult Indian programs.

Program Scope:

During fiscal year 1974, the Office of Education received 110 applications to support planning, pilot, and demonstration projects. Thirty-eight applicants received grant awards. In general, applications consisted of proposed pilot and demonstration projects designed to improve the employment and educational opportunities of adult Indians. More specifically, the approved applications dealt with the development of projects which would enable Indian adults to obtain high school diplomas, improve their communication skills, and participate in career development programs.

Program Effectiveness:

This program has been in operation only a short time and measures of effectiveness will not be available until next year. However, there is an Indian Education Program Monitoring and Process Evaluation System in the

the developmental stage. This system is designed to determine if the major programs under the Indian Education Act are meeting the goals and objectives specified in the law.

Ongoing and Planned Evaluation Studies:

None at present

Ongoing process evaluation survey

Sources of Evaluation Data:

Program review materials

Program audits

FORMAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

FORMAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
A Title I Education of Disadvantaged Children	Selecting Exemplary Compensatory Education Projects for Dissemination Via Project Information Packages. RMC Research Corporation, Los Altos, California, August, 1974. Design Considerations for Packaging Effective Approaches in Compensatory Education. RMC Research Corporation, Los Altos, California, June 1974. A Procedural Guide for Validating Achievement Gains in Educational Projects, RMC Research Corporation, Los Altos, California, May, 1974. An Analysis of the Relationship Between Reading and Mathematics Achievement Gains and Per-Pupil Expenditures in California Title I Projects, Fiscal Year 1972. Palo Alto, California: American Institutes for Research, March 1973. ESEA Title I: A Reanalysis and Synthesis of Evaluation Data From Fiscal Year 1965 through 1970. Palo Alto, California: American Institutes for Research, March 1972.	Review of Progress in Selected States in Meeting Special Educational Needs (Title I, ESEA of 1965) DHEW Audit Agency, August 1974 (13-50004). State Evaluation Reports on ESEA Title I, Fiscal Years 1971-74. The Silken Purse: Legislative Recommendations for Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Washington, D.C.: The Planar Corporation, May 1973a. A Synthesis and Analysis of Available Local and State Title I Achievement Procedures and Results, Washington, D.C.: The Planar Corporation, May, 1973b. Review of the Implementation of Comparability Provisions of P.L. 91-230. DHEW Audit Agency, October 1972. Data Analysis of 1969-70 Survey of Compensatory Education (Title I). Amherst, Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts, undated.	Guidebook for Conducting Educational Evaluations, RCM Research Corporation, Los Altos, California, November 1974. Final Report on The Development of Project Information Packages for Effective Approaches in Compensatory Education, RMC Research Corporation, November, 1974. A Descriptive and Analytic Study of Compensatory Reading Programs: Phase I Report. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service August, 1973: Completion Date December, 1974. The Process of Funds Allocation Under Title I of the Elementary Secondary Education Act of 1965. Interim Report Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards (Technical Analysis Division March 1973. A Study of Selected Aspects of ESEA, Title I Reading Programs. Washington, D.C.: Government Accounting Office. Completion Date: November, 1974.

FORMAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS
COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
		Education of the disadvantaged An evaluative report on Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act 1968. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1970. Foundations for success in educating disadvantaged children. Palo Alto, Calif.: American Institutes for Research December 1968b.	

FORMAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS
COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
e I Neglected and Delinquent Children		Analysis of 1968-69 Compensatory Education for Selected Sub-Groups Pupils, Boulder, Colorado: University of Colorado Laboratory of Educational Research, Autust 1970 (and Appendices).	Design of an Evaluation for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, Title I Neglected and Delinquent Programs. Marshall Kaplan, Gans and Kahn, February 1975. Report on the Administration of the Neglected and Delinquent Children Title I ESEA Program. DHEW Audit Agency, July 1974.

FORMAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS
COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
Title I Children of Migrant Workers	Evaluation of ESEA Title I Program For Migratory Children of Migratory Agricultural Workers. January 1974. (OE/OPBE).	Impact of the Federal Programs to Improve the Hiring Conditions Migrant and Other Seasonal Farmworkers. (February 1973). (GAO). Study of the Settling-Out Process Among Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers. (September 1973). (DHEW/OSC). Report on Audit on the Administration of the Migrant Children Education Program. (July 1972). (DHEW/AA). Early Childhood Programs for Migrants: Alternatives for the States. (May 1972). (ECS). Wednesday's Children. (1971). (National Committee on the Education of Migrant Children). Decision Making Framework: Migrant Education. (June 1971). DHEW/ASPE).	Draft Summary Report on the Migrant Children Education Program. (May 1974 DHEW Audit Agency).

FORMAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS
COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
A Title III, Supplementary Educational Centers Services	NONE NONE	Brightman, Jerome B. The Process of Innovation: A Model of Planned Change Resulting from an Assessment of Three-Year ESEA Title III Projects, June 1974. Catalyst for Change: A National Study of ESEA Title III (PACE): University of Kentucky, 1967. PACE: Catalyst for Change, The Second National Study of PACE. University of Kentucky, 1968. Hearn, Norman. Innovative Educational Programs: A Study of the Influence of Selected Variables Upon Their Continuation Following the Termination of Three Year Title III Grants. 1969. Polemeni, Anthony J. A Study of Title III Projects, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 1965.(P.L.83-531 89-10)), After the Approved Funding Periods. April, 1969.	Rand Corporation, Inc. A Study of Change-Agent Programs, January 1975. (ESEA Title VII, Voc. Ed., Part D, and Right to Read are also studied). Rand Corporation, Inc. An Evaluation of ESEA Titles III and VII, October 1975. Stanford Research Institute, An Evaluation of the Field Test of Project Information Packages, September, 1976.

FORMAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS
COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
EA Title V, Section 503, Grants to trengthen State Departments of Education	None	Center for Educational Policy Research, Harvard Graduate School of Education Grease the Squeaky Wheel: A Report on the Implementation of Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Grants To Strengthen State Departments of Education, February 1973.	None

FORMAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS
COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
ESEA Title VII, the Bilingual Education Act	Development Associates, Inc., A Process Evaluation of the Bilingual Program, December 1973 See also A Study of Change-Agent Programs under Title III.		American Institutes for Research Inc. Evaluation of the Bilingual Education Program. November 1976.

FORMAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS
COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
Emergency School Assistance			
Emergency School Assistance Program - School District Grants	Resource Management Corporation, Evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program, February 1972. National Opinion Research Center, Southern Schools: An Evaluation of the Effects of the Emergency School Assistance Program and School Desegregation, Fall 1973.	General Accounting Office, Need to Improve Policies & Procedures for Approving Grants Under the Emergency School Assistance Program, 1971. General Accounting Office, Weaknesses in School Districts' Implementation of the Emergency School Assistance Program, 1971. Washington Research Project, et. al., The Emergency School Assistance Program: An Evaluation, 1970.	Educational Testing Service, Study of the Identification of Exemplary Desegregated Schools and Evaluation of the Determinants of Success, Fall 1975 Rand Corporation, Further Analysis of the ESAP-II Evaluation Data, July 1975.
Community Groups Grants	Kirschner Associates, Inc., ESAP Community Group: An Evaluation, October 1972.	Southern Education Foundation, ESAP Community Grants: A Preliminary Report, November, 1971.	NONE
Title IV, Civil Rights Act of 1964	NONE	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Title IV and School Desegregation: A Study of Neglected Federal Program, 1973. Race Relations Information Center, Title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act: A Program in Search of a Policy, 1970.	Rand Corporation, Evaluation of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, November 1975.

FORMAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS
COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas, P. L. 81-874 and 81-815		Battelle Memorial Institute, School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas, A Study of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815. December, 1969.	

FORMAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS
COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA, P. L. 92-318)			
1. Basic LEA Program	None	None	Systems Development Corp. Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Basic LEA Program: A Comparative Evaluation of Three Types of Educational Intervention., February 1976. Interim report due February 1975.
2. Pilot Program	None	None	
3. Nonprofit Groups Program	None	None	
4. Bilingual Program	None	None	
5. Metropolitan Area Program	None	None	Systems Development Corp. A Longitudinal Evaluation of the ESAA Pilot Program, February, 1976. Interim reports due February 1975.
6. Special Reading Program	None	None	
7. Educational Television Program	None	None	
8. Special Projects (assistance to schools in jurisdictions other than States and D. C.)	None	None	

FORMAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS
COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
Follow Through	Report on the Follow Through Later Grade Study, Huron Institute, April 30, 1973 Final Report on the Pupil Assignment and Promotion Study, Huron Institute, April 30, 1973 Problems in Longitudinal Analysis, Huron Institute, June 30, 1973. Final Report on Sample Selection, Huron Institute, June 30, 1973. Final Report on Follow Through City Data, Huron Institute, June 30 1973. Report on Teacher Effects, Sample and Design, Huron Institute, January 31, 1974. Follow Through Summer Study, Huron Institute, February 28, 1974. Progress Report on the Instrumentation Study, Huron Institute, June 1, 1974. Preliminary Report on Teachers Effects, Huron Institute, July 1, 1974.		Education as Experimentations: Evaluation of the Follow Through Planned Variation Model, Kindergarten and First Grade Longitudinal Effects, ABT Associates, October 1974. Follow Through Sponsor Evaluation Reports, October 1974. Follow Through LEA Evaluation Reports, October 1974.

FORMAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS
COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
	Review of Follow Through Sponsor and Local Data, Final Report, Huron Institute, August 31, 1974. A Study of Teachers Impact on Student Learning, Huron Institute September 1974. Units of Analysis Issues in the Evaluation of Project Follow Through, Huron Institute, Sept. 1974. Follow Through Classroom Observation 1972-1973, Stanford Research August, 1974. Education as Experimentation: A Planned Variation Model, 2 Vols. Abt Associates, Inc., March 1, 1974. Abt Associates, An Analysis of Selected Data 1969-1972 January 31, 1973 Huron Institute, Follow Through City Study, June 30, 1973 Stanford Research Institute, Follow Through Program Classroom Observation Evaluation, August, 1973		

FORMAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Evaluations Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
	Stanford Research Institute, Interim Evaluation of the National Follow Through Program, 1969-71, February 1973. Abt Associates, Analysis of Follow Through Data, October 1973 Follow Through Sponsor Evaluation Reports, Sept. 1973 Follow Through LEA Evaluation Reports, Sept. 1973		

FORMAL PROGRAM EVALUATIONS COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Evalations Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Evaluation Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
1. Student Assistance (All Programs)	June 1971 - Model to Analyze Alternative Student Aid Programs - Mathematica (Washington, D. C.) October 1974 - A Study of Characteristics of Colleges and Students - U. S. Bureau of Census (Washington, D. C.) August 1974 - A Design of an Alternative Needs Analysis System (Rosemergy)	April 1964 - The Impact of Office of Education Student Assistance Programs ACE (Washington, D. C.) December 1973 - Financing Post-Secondary Education in the United States The National Commission on the Financing of Post-Secondary Education (Wash., D. C.)	December 1975 - The National Planning Model NCHEMS, The Impact of Alternative Levels of Student Aid Funds on Institutional Resources (Denver, Colo. June 1974 (ASPE) Enrollment Effects of Tuition Differentials ICF-Inc. (Washington, D.C.) February 1975 - A Study of the Impact of Student Financial Aid Programs - Design Phase-Higher Education Research Institute. (Los Angeles, Calif.)
2. Basic Educational Opportunity Grants Program (See also Item 1)	September 1973 - Analysis of Assets under BEOG Needs Analysis--CEEB (Washington, D. C.) August 1972 - Basic Opportunity Grants (an estimate) - Joseph Froomkin (Washington, D. C.)	October 1974 - (BEOG Staff) A A Survey of Post-Secondary School Enrollment - 1973 Bureau of Census (Washington, D. C.)	1975 (ASPE) - Enrollment Patterns Under Modifications to the Basic Grants Program - Inner City Fund (Washington, D. C.) December 1974 - Three Phase Study of Costs and Funding--CEEB (Washington, D. C.)
3. The College Work-Study Program (See also Item 1)	August 1968 - An Analysis of Recipients and Institutions Participating in College Work-Study Program--ETS (Princeton, N. J.) Feb. 1973 - A Comprehensive Study of the College Work-Study Program-Bureau of Applied Research (Columbia Univ.)		

Program Title	Completed OPBE Evaluations Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Evaluation Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
4. The Guaranteed Student Loan Program (See also Item 1)	November 1974 - A Loan Default and Interest Subsidy Budget Projection Model and Historical Analysis of OE Program Data Files--SystemsGroup, Inc. (Washington, D. C.) September 1974 - A Study of Special Allowance and Servicing Costs and Funding - Technology Management Corp. (Cambridge, Mass.)	June 1973 - U. S. General Accounting Office Report to Congress December 1970 - Management Study of GSLP (Program Staff) Lybrand Ross Bros. & Montgomery (Philadelphia, Pa.)	February 1975 - A Survey of Lender Repayment Terms and Survey of Repayment Burden Among Borrowers--Resource Management Corp. (Bethesda, Md.) February 1975 - (ASPE) A Study of Advantages and Disadvantages of Student Loans for Women- Joseph Froomkin, Inc. (Washington, D. C.)
5. Educational Opportunity Grant Program (See also Item I)	June 1971 - A Study of Institutions and Recipients Participating in the Educational Opportunity Grant Program - Bureau of Applied Social Research (Columbia Univ.)		December 1974 - Three Phase Study of Costs and Funding College Entrance Examination Board (Washington, D. C.)
6. Cooperative Education Program (See also Item 1)		July 1974 - Impact of Cooperative Education upon Personal Development and Growth of Values--Northeastern Univ. (Boston, Mass.) May 1974 - Documented Employer Benefits from Cooperative Education. A. D. Little, Inc. (Cambridge, Mass.)	December 1974 - Cooperative Education Planning Paper - COMSAD Research Corp. (Pittsburgh, Pa.)
7. The National Defense Student Loan Program. (See also Item 1)	Cancelled - A Comprehensive Study of the National Defense Student Loan Program Educational Testing Service (Princeton, N. J.)	1963 - A Study of The National Defense Student Loan Program - College Entrance Examination Board (New York, N. Y.)	

Program Title	Completed OPBE Evaluations Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Evaluation Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
8. State Student Incentive Grant Program		November 1974 - State Scholarship Programs (Annual) - Nat. Assoc. of State Scholarship Programs.	
9. The Upward Bound Program	June 1974 - A Study of the Upward Bound Program-KOBA Enterprises, Washington, D. C. September 1974 - The Effectiveness of Secondary and Higher Education Intervention Programs - Tinto & Sherman (Teachers College, Columbia University)	February 1970 - OEO-A Study of the Upward Bound Program - Greenleigh Associates, (New York) December 1973 - U. S. General Accounting Office Report to Congress	July 1975 - A Comprehensive Study of Pre-College Counseling with Emphasis on Talent Search and Upward Bound Research Triangle Institute, N. C.
10. The Talent Search Program	September 1974 - The Effectiveness of Secondary and Higher Education Intervention Programs - Tinto & Sherman (Teachers College, Columbia University)		July 1975 - A Comprehensive Study of Pre-College Counseling with Emphasis on Talent Search and Upward Bound Research Triangle Institute, N. C.
11. Special Services for Disadvantaged Students	November 1974 - A Study of the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students Program - ETS (Princeton, N. J.) September 1974 - The Effectiveness of Secondary and Higher Education Intervention Programs - Tinto & Sherman (Teachers College, Columbia University)	1972 - Higher Education and the Disadvantaged Student - (Astin and others) Human Service Press, (Washington, D. C.)	
12. HEA - Title IX (Includes NDEA Fellowship Programs)	July 1970 - Study of NDEA Title IV Fellowship Programs - Bureau of Social Science Research (Washington, D.C.)	August 1974 - Enrollment of Minority Graduate Students at PH.D. Granting Institutions - ACE (Washington, D. C.)	

	Program Title	Completed OPBE Evaluations Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Evaluation Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
13.	Education Professions Development Act - Part E - Fellowships & Institutes Programs	February 1973 - Evaluation Study of Education Personnel Development Act Training Programs for Higher Education Personnel - ABT (Cambridge, Mass.)		
14.	Grants and Loans for Construction of Academic Facilities Programs	June 1968 - An Evaluative Study of the College Facilities Program - Florida State University October 1974 - Planning Study for Higher Education Facilities Construction. Joseph Froomkin, Inc. (Washington, D. C.)	September 1974 - College and Universities Facilities; Expectations of Space and Maintenance Needs for 1974 - American Council on Education (Washington, D. C.)	December 1974 - (ASPE) A Study of the Oversupply of college Spaces Joseph Froomkin, Inc., (Washington, D. C.)
15.	State Administration of Planning Program		1974 - Statewide Planning in Higher Education - USOE/BPE K. Halsted	
16.	Foreign Language & Area Centers, Research & Studies Programs Fulbright-Hays Act	Cancelled - Evaluation of Programs Supporting Research and Training Abroad - McBer & Company (Cambridge, Mass.)	May 1973 - Language and Area Studies Review - Richard D. Lambert, Social Science Research Council (Philadelphia, Pa.)	
17.	Community Service & Continuing Education Program	June 1974 - The Evaluation of Projects Supported Under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Peat, Marwick, Mitchell, and Company (Washington, D. C.)		

Program Title	Completed OPBE Evaluations Date - Month & Year	Other Completed Evaluation Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
18. **Strengthening Developing Institutions Program**	September 1973 - A Study of the Developing Institutions Program - CRDHE (Berkeley, Calif.) **September 1974 - Facilities at Predominantly Black Institutions of Higher Education 1970-71 Joseph Froomkin, Inc. (Washington, D. C.)**	August 1967 - Lawrence C. Howard Institute of Human Relations, University of Wisconsin. **November 1970 - Use and Effectiveness of Title III in Selected Developing Institutions - (USOE/BR) Miller (University of Michigan)**	**April 1975 - A Study Design for Evaluation of the Strengthening Developing Institutions Program - A. D. Little, Inc. (Cambridge, Mass.)**
19. **Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility Staff**	**November 1974 - Private Accreditation and Public Eligibility - Brookings Institute & National Academy for Public Administration (Washington, D. C.)**		**January 1975 - ASPE - Changing Credential Objectives of Students in Post-Secondary Education - Joseph Froomkin, Inc. (Washington, D. C.)**

FORMAT PROGRAM EVALUATIONS
COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date-Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluation in Process Completion Due Date
Vocational Education	Vocational Impact Study	Cost Effectiveness of Selected Cooperative Vocational Educational Programs Without a Cooperative Component (DOAE) 6/73 Batelle Corp. Columbus, Ohio	Project Metro: Evaluation of Data on Vocational Education Programs in Major Metropolitan Areas (OPBE: 1/74) Educational Systems Research Institue Inc. Pittsburg, Pa.
Basic Grants to States	Study of State Grant Mechanism. 9/72 National Planning Assoc. Washington, D.C.		
	Study of Adult Vocational Programs in 3 Cities 10/71 Analytic Systems Washington, D.C.		
	Study of Community Colleges and Vocational Technical Centers 6/71 BSSR - Washington, D.C.		
	Study of Vocational and Proprietary Schools 5/72 AIR; Palo Alto, Calif.		Change Agent Study (OPBE, see also under Title III, ESEA)
	Assessment of Vocational Education for the Handicapped (OPBE: 10/74) Olympus Research Corp. San Francisco, Calif.		
Programs for Students with Special Needs			
Research and Training			

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date-Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluation in Process Completion Due Date
Exemplary Programs			Assessment of Exemplary Programs (OPBE: 1/75) Development Associate Washington, D.C.
Consumer and Homemaking			
Cooperative Education and Work Study		Evaluation of School-Supervised Work Education Programs (OPBE: Part I: 10/73 Systems Development Corp. Santa Monica, Calif.	Evaluation of School Supervised Work Education Programs (OPBE: 10/75) Olympus Research Corp. San Francisco, Calif.
Curriculum Development			
Adult Education			
Basic Grants to States	Longitudinal Evaluation of the ABE Program (OPBE: 10/73) Systems Develop. Corp., Falls Church, Va.		
Special Projects			Research and Evaluation on Adult Education and the Special Projects Program (OPBE: 9/75) Kirschner Associates Albuquerque, New Mexico
Teacher Training			

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date-Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
Manpower Development & Training Act of 1962	Assessment of MDTA Skills Centers 6/71 Olympus Research Corp. San Francisco, Calif.	MDTA Outcome Study (DOL) 4/72 Decision Making Info. Santa Ana, Calif.	
	MDTA Basic Education Study 4/73 North American Rockwell Corp., Wash., D.C.	MDTA Systems Study (DOL) 4/71 North American Rockwell Corp., Wash., D.C.	
	Effectiveness of MDTA for Women (OPBE: 3/74) Mark Battle Corp. Washington, D.C.	Evaluation of MDTA Individual Referred Program (DOL) 9/72 Olympus Research Corp. San Francisco, Calif.	

FORMAT PROGRAM EVALUATIONS COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date-Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
Education of the Handicapped State Grant Programs		Evaluation of State Administered Programs for the Handicapped: Organization for Social and Technical Innovation, Inc. 1970	
	Evaluation of an Aid-to-States Program for Education of Handicapped Children; Exotech Systems, Inc. March 1974		Evaluation of Educational Programs in State-Operated and State-Supported Schools for Handicapped Children (P.L. 89-313); Feb. 1975
Special Education Manpower Development	Evaluation of Federal Programs to Increase the Pool of Special Education Teachers; RMC, Inc. Jan., 1973		
	Study of the Need for Educational Manpower for Handicapped Children; Operations Research, Inc., 1970		
Media Services and Captioned Films			
Recruitment and Information			
Regional Resource Centers			

2/

PROGRAM EVALU S
COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Evaluations	Other Evaluations	Evaluations in Process
Programs for Deaf-Blind Children			
Early Childhood Education		Evaluation of Early Childhood Education Projects, 1969-1972; Teaching Research, Oregon, 1972	Evaluation of the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program: Battelle. Dec., 1975
Specific Learning Disabilities			
Innovation and Development		Evaluation Methods and Results in Research and Development Efforts for Handicapped Children; URS Research Company. Oct., 1972	

FORMAT PROGRAM EVALUATIONS
COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date-Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluation in Process Completion Due Date
Teacher Corps - EPDA, Pt. B-1, 90-35	Full Scale Implementation of a Process Evaluation System for Programs of the WCIES. December, 1972. Resource Management Corporation Study of Strategies in Selected Projects Supported by NCILS December, 1972, Abt & Assoc.		Longitudinal Evaluation of 6th Cycle Teacher Corps. August 31, 1974. Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corporation, 12/74
EPDA - Pts. D&T, P.L. 90-35	Full Scale Implementation of a Process Evaluation System for Programs of the NCIES. December, 1972. Resource Management Corporation Study of Strategies in Selected Projects Supported by NCIES. December, 1972, Abt & Assoc.		
FHDA - Pt. D, P.L. 90-35 Career Opportunities Program (COP)	Career Opportunities Program (COP) Impact Evaluation. December, 1972, Abt & Assoc.		
EPDA - Pt. D, P.L. 90-35 Training of Teacher Training (TTT)		Evidence of Outcomes of the TTT Program. September, 1972. Evaluative Research Center, Univ. of Virginia	

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date-Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
Drug Abuse Education (DAE Act)		NDEP Successful Practices Study. BRX, Inc/Shelley & Co., Inc. June 30, 1974	
Nutrition and Health (ESEA Sec. 803)			
Data Systems Improvement: Educational Statistics National Achievement Study (CRA)			

Program Title	Completed OPRE Eval. Date-Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
Higher Education Act-Title IIA Academic Library Resources	None		
Higher Education Act-Title IIB		1) Overview of the Library Fellowship Program - Bureau of Social Science Inc. Washington, D.C.	
Career Training - Libraries		2) Data Collection & Description of HEA IIB Institutes USOE	
Higher Education Act-Title IIB	None		
Library Demonstrations			
Undergraduate Instructional Equipment - HEA VIA	None		
NDEA - Title III		1) NDEA Title III, Fiscal Year 1959-67, A Management View USOE, May 1969	
Equipment & Minor Remodeling		2) Strengthening Instruction in Science Mathematics, Foreign Languages, and the Humanities and Arts (A Chapter appearing in) The Federal-State Partnership for Education - GPO, May 1970 3) Strengthening Instruction in Academic Subjects USOE	

FORMAT PROGRA LUATIONS
COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date-Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process , Completion Due Date
Elementary & Secondary Education Act - Title II		The ESEA Title II Evaluative Survey - DHEW-OE, Nov. 1970	
School Library Resources			
Library Services & Construction Act - Title I Library Services	1) A Study of Public Library Service to the Disadvantaged in Selected Cities, September, 1970, Behavior Science Corp. Washington, D.C. 2) A Study of Exemplary Public Library Reading of Reading Related Programs for Children, Youth, and Adults, July, 1972, Barss Reitzel & Associates, Inc., Cambridge, Mass. 3) The Public Library and Federal Policy, July 1973 System Development, Corp. Santa Monica, California 4) Evaluation of LSCA Services to Special Target Groups August, 1973 System Development Corp., Sante Monica, California	An Overview of the Library Services & Construction Act Title I, Jules Mensel, 1969 System Development Corp. Santa Monica, Calif.	
Library Services & Construction Act, Title II Interlibrary Cooperation			
Library Services & Construction Act - Title I-Library Construction	1) Evaluation of LSCA Services to Special Target Groups August, 1973 System Development Corp. Santa Monica, California		

FORMAT PROGRAM EVALUATIONS COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date-Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
Right to Read Cooperative Research Act; PL 83-531; 68 Stat. 533, as amended by the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965; P.L. 89-10; Title IV; 79 Stat. 44; 20 U.S.C. 331	1. Contemporary Research Incorporated (Contract No. OEC-0-72-5154/SB 9203 (a) - 72-C-368) "Evaluation of Right to Read School Based Sites" - Final Report due October 31, 1973 2. Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corporation (Contract No. OEC-0-73-5174/SB-3-2-0-8A-73-C-380) "Design of Evaluation Plan for the Right to Read Community Based Projects - Final Rept. due September 30, 1973* 3. Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corp. "Evaluation of the Community Based Right to Read Program," 9/74		
Environmental Education Act, P.L. 91-516			

* See also Change Agent Study under Title III, ESEA

FORMAT PROGRAM EVALUATIONS
COMPLETED AND IN PROCESS

Program Title	Completed OPBE Eval. Date-Month & Year	Other Completed Eval. Investigator and Date	Evaluations in Process Completion Due Date
Educational Broadcasting Facilities Act	The Future of Educational Telecommunication: A Planning Study (Battelle) Oct. 1973	Surveys of Existing Facilities - NCES	
Sesame Street and the Electric Companysy (Children's Television Workshop)		1) The First Year of Sesame Street. An Evaluation - ETS October 1970 2) The Second Year of Sesame Street. A Continuing Evaluation - ETS, October 1971 3) Who Watched the Electric Company. The Electric Co. in - School Utilization Study: The 1971-72 School & Teacher Survey - Florida State University - 1972 4) The Children's Television Workshop: How & Why it Works- Nassau Board of Cooperative Educational Services 1972	The Federal Role in Children's Television - Indiana University -Mar. 1975
Special Technology			